RES SACRAMENTI

Watertight arguments concluding to the invalidity of the *Novus Ordo* Mass, as mediated to us in the vernacular

By Rev. Fr. P.D. Meuli, S.T.D., U.J.D., Ph.L., LL.B.,
Rotal Advocate,
Barrister and Solicitor of the High Court of New Zealand

Mount Saint Mary's Church
4 Rangiwai Road
Titirangi
Auckland 1007
New Zealand

Telephone: +64 9 817 7582

Email: fr.meuli@bigfoot.com

Website: www.ressacramenti.homestead.com

US$2.50 including worldwide shipping

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

P.D. Meuli, born 22 September 1926, entered the national seminary, Mosgiel, New Zealand in 1951. He transferred to the Urban College for the Propagation of the Faith and to the Urban University, Rome, in 1953 where he obtained a Licentiate in Theology and a Licentiate in Philosophy in 1956 and 1959 respectively. December 22, 1956 he was ordained to the priesthood. He secured a Doctorate in Theology at the Gregorian University in 1959, returned to New Zealand to work in parishes in the Auckland diocese. He graduated Bachelor of Laws from the Auckland University Law School in 1976 and was admitted as a Barrister and Solicitor of the Supreme Court of New Zealand the same year. He returned to Rome to enter the Lateran University School of Canon and Civil Law in 1976 and graduated in 1980 *Doctor in Utroque Jure, Summa cum Laude* after defending the thesis: 'The Status and the Defences of the Unborn Child in Common Law'. A three year course of studies in law was then undertaken in the school of the Sacred Roman Rota leading, in 1983, to the qualification 'Rotal Advocate' licensed to appear before the Sacred Roman Rota and the Signatura Apostolica. This was followed by an administrative law course given by the Sacred Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Cult. From 1980 to 1985 he was attached to the Regional Tribunal located in Bologna, Italy where he functioned as Defender of the Bond.

In 1985 he returned to New Zealand and parish work. In 1987 he became acquainted with the arguments of Patrick Henry Omlor, particularly Mr Omlor's 'Questioning the Validity of the Masses using the new, all-English Canon.' From then on Father Meuli was in turmoil until he returned to the Immemorial Mass, the Mass for which he had been ordained. By the kindness of the then Ordinary (Bishop Denis Browne) of the Diocese of Auckland, this was greatly facilitated. In 1989 a small church was detached from the jurisdiction of the parish wherein it is located and placed under Father's care. This singular apostolate was designated: 'Alternative Ministry.' There, to this day (November 2000), eleven years later, Mass is celebrated and the sacraments administered according to the old rite.

Rev. Fr. Meuli can be reached at:

Mount Saint Mary's Church
4 Rangiwai Road
Titirangi
Auckland 1007
New Zealand

Telephone: +64 9 817 7582

Email: fr.meuli@bigfoot.com

Website: www.ressacramenti.homestead.com

DEDICATION

To the Immaculate Heart

A GLAD DUTY

My thanks to Mrs Catherine Molloy who made valuable suggestions as to style and other matters of presentation; to Mr Francis Yuen who oversaw computer operations, formatted and did specialist editing of the work; to Captain Timothy Hungerford-Morgan, who took over the printing and distribution; to those who helped with suggestions and to all who frequently inquired: 'When are you going to finish it, for heaven's sake?' My thanks also to those who inundated me with objections and remonstrations, none more than mildly vituperative. And finally, special thanks to those who thought I had become feeble-minded or, at best, lacked sound judgment and who courteously proffered advice to stop forthwith and direct my mind and energies to something worthwhile, for my own good and for the good of those who would be deceived by me if I continued with this ghastly initiative.

I hope they are not, after all, proved right.

FOREWORD

This writing and the eighty or so pages which follow are an advertising exercise. I want Patrick Henry Omlor's *The Robber Church*, the anthology of his writings from 1967 to 1997, published by Silvio Mattacchioni and Co., P.O. Box 9, Stouffville, Ontario, L 4 A 7 Z 4, telephone: 905 985 3555, Fax 905 985 4005, to become a runaway best seller. If that proves in the event unrealizable I would, at least, that a copy of his book be in the hands of every Latin rite priest in the world.

I am dismayed that I did not set to sooner to make these writings known as far and as wide as I can manage. They are incisive, vigorous and clear; they sweep everything before them. I am profoundly grateful that they happened in my path before I was too old to do much or even anything, about them. As it is, it has taken me fourteen years to take sufficient fright at my finally perceived responsibility towards my confreres, to make known this argument of devastating cogency. I regret that lapse of time deeply.

When I first essayed a brief reproduction of Mr Omlor's argument to send to two ladies who requested something in writing concerning the new Mass, the conviction began growing upon me that the argument should be propagated far more widely. As it happens, that matter was effectively taken out of my hands: one of the ladies, immediately on receipt of the brief résumé, sent it off to various people, inviting comment. Within a few days I became the target of numerous letters, from various parts of the world. One thing led to another and very soon I found myself nailed to the word processor, working practically exclusively on the now expanded argument which follows this foreword.

Inevitably there is, here and there, something original in what follows. The mistakes are original to me - I don't think there are any, but the occasional typographical error may have eluded me. Chapter 2, with its legal analysis of *Instauratio Liturgica*, is original, so is the argument in the second Appendix to Chapter 1, showing the necessary place of synecdoche in an analysis of the sacraments. There will be other snippets similarly original. In that connection, I now ask anyone reading this work to advise me of anything erroneous, or perhaps obscure, to be found therein. Those in possession of arguments *pro* or arguments *contra*, will do me a signal service if they instruct me in them. My postal address is: Mount Saint Mary's Church, 4 Rangiwai Road, Titirangi, Auckland 1007, New Zealand.

Michael Davies' *Pope Paul's New Mass* (The Angelus Press, Dickinson, Texas 77539) figures prominently in Chapter Two from No. 112 to No. 131. Mr Davies has discovered, researched and chronicled, in the matter of those reforming the liturgy, an incompetence so crass as to excite speechless disbelief, so crass indeed as to turn one's thoughts and judgment, however reluctantly, to the suspicion of deliberate villainy.

The Western church has been subjected to revolution. It has been laid waste and

the revolutionaries, for the nonce, are triumphantly in possession of the wreckage. Revolution by its nature does not build, it tears down and has nothing to put in the place of what it has destroyed. It can do nothing but make face-saving and ineffectual efforts to camouflage with *Newspeak* the heartbreaking, devastating damage.

Other people, not revolutionaries, people of a different indoles, have to come along to sift through the wreckage, rescue what they can, and start the work of reconstruction. Such people are around but they are few. It will take time for the number of them to increase so as to reach critical mass. Between destruction and completed reconstruction many generations have to be born and live and die.

Those interim generations are born and live and die in a diminished world. If it is hard for a good man to be saved (1 Peter, 4:18), what is to be said of those for whom, stripped of the principal means of sanctity, the difficulties of becoming good are multiplied extravagantly day by day?

If the argument presented in the following work concludes correctly, the Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ have not been seen around these parts for the past thirty years. That means that there are not a few priests, maybe the occasional bishop, trafficking around, who have not yet made their First Communion. It means that no one has been able to fulfill his Sunday obligation, or his Easter duties, these past several decades. No Mass has been said in suffrage of the Holy Souls. Contractual obligations involving Mass intentions for which stipends have been given remain still to be met.

If the argument in the following work does not conclude correctly, then the fallacy must be identified and demonstrated. If that is not done, or if no one attempts to do it, the argument will not go away, it will simply lie, indigestible and menacing, until it is dealt with.

If the fallacy cannot be identified and demonstrated, but a 'gut' feeling renders one loath to give the argument weight, then it must be inquired: does the argument, at least, raise a doubt? When there is a doubt, in the administration of the sacraments the *via tutior*, i.e. the safer way, is always to be followed, if a safer way actually exists. In this matter a safer way does exist. It is the one I took, now years ago. It is the Mass codified by Pope St Pius V in his Apostolic Constitution *Quo Primum.*

RES SACRAMENTI

CHAPTER I

WATERTIGHT IV

1. There are six arguments concluding to the invalidity of the *Novus Ordo* Mass, as mediated to us in the vernacular. Of these six, one is so cogent as to exclude all possibility of refutation. It is watertight. It is as follows.

2. The Mass is rendered valid when the sacrament of Holy Eucharist is confected validly. Holy Eucharist has been confected validly when there is present, no longer bread and wine, but the body, blood, soul and divinity of our Lord.

3. If, after whatever the priest celebrant has done, the bread and wine are unchanged, the sacrament has not been confected and as a consequence the Mass is invalid.

4. How to tell whether there are only bread and wine there in front of you or the body and blood? One way is to examine and analyse the steps taken up to the moment when the body and blood should be there.

5. To comprehend quite what that might entail we have to know something about the sacraments. Sacraments are signs. Signs signify. The job of a sign is to signify. It signifies something other than itself.

6. There is a bit of wood on a post at the beginning of this road where I am presently typing this explanation. On the bit of wood is written: *Rangiwai Road.* The bit of wood and the writing on it constitute a sign. The sign signifies something other than itself. What does this sign signify? It signifies that the strip of tar seal the sign is pointing to is a road called Rangiwai Road.

7. The sign did not produce Rangiwai Road. Ordinary signs do not produce the things they signify. Ordinary signs do all that is expected of them by simply signifying whatever it is they are designed to signify.

8. Sacraments are different. Sacraments are signs, but they are very special signs. Sacraments not only signify but actually produce or effect the thing they signify. They bring into being the very thing they signify. The thing each of them will signify will be a grace of some kind. Hence the definition of a sacrament: *Signum sensibile, efficax gratiae, a Christo institutum,* i.e. 'A sensible sign, efficacious of grace, instituted by Christ.'

9. On this very matter the Supreme Pontiff, Leo XIII, taught:

> 'All know that the sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace must both signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify.' [1]

10. An easily understood example of that is provided by the Sacrament of Baptism. The Sacrament of Baptism, like all the sacraments is a sign. The sign which it is, is made up of two things: water and words. The water is called the *matter* of the sacrament, while the words: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,* are called the *form.*

---

[1] *Apostolicae Curae,* 1896.

11. All sacraments are made up of *matter* and *form.* It is the matter and form together which make up the sign which is the sacrament. The application of the matter and form to the recipient produces in the recipient the effect which the sacrament is signifying.

12. In the case of baptism the water is poured over the person to be baptized. While the water is being poured, words (i.e. the form) are said which signify the end or goal intended by the pouring of the water.

13. The two things together, i.e. the pouring of the water and the saying of the words, signify the cleansing of the recipient.

14. Because all that is done *In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,* it is clear that we are not dealing with just ordinary ablutions. This kind of cleansing is very special because it cleanses one of sin which blocks our going to heaven. That that is what it does is clear from Our Lord's words: 'Unless a man is born from above of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' (J.3:3).

15. Every one of the sacraments gives a grace that is special to that sacrament and not given by any other. Since there are seven sacraments that means that there are seven special graces. The special grace of the sacrament of baptism is, as mentioned above, the cleansing from sin, original sin in a baby, original sin and actual sin together, in the case of an adult. The term commonly used to describe all that is *inward justification.*

16. What I have called a special grace is known by other names too. It is sometimes referred to as the 'sacramental grace'. Occasionally you might meet it referred to as the 'crowning effect' of the sacrament, or perhaps the 'power of the sacrament' or the 'virtue of the sacrament'. The grace 'proper to the sacrament' is another term used. These terms all amount to the same thing.

17. Theologians prefer to refer to this special grace as the *res sacramenti,* two Latin words which may be translated as the *reality of the sacrament.* The *reality of the sacrament* means the grace proper to that sacrament.

18. The *reality of the sacrament* is the reason the sacrament was instituted in the first place. The sacrament was instituted to communicate the *reality of the sacrament* to the recipient. If it does not do that, the 'sacrament ' is not a sacrament at all. In other words it is invalid.

19. There are various ways of rendering a sacrament invalid. One way would be to use invalid matter. If I try to baptize someone with ass's milk in place of water I will not succeed in baptizing that person.

20. For some years some dioceses in the United States used invalid matter in confecting the sacrament of Holy Eucharist. They used not bread but what was described in the account of it as *cookie mixture,* on the principle that bread is boring, but cookie mixture is liked by everybody.

21. It does not matter what their motive was, though the sheer fecklessness of that particular aberration is downright amazing, it suffices that they used invalid matter. Cookie mixture is certainly invalid matter.

22. Astonishingly the perpetrators of that continuing sacrilege showed themselves contumacious when Rome intervened, as it did - several times. It took seven years for Rome to prevail.

23. In the meantime, the obligation of restitution, an obligation due in justice, of all the Mass stipends given, during those seven years, was never mentioned.

24. Nor was any mention made of, or apology proffered for, the material idolatry occasioned by being presented with a bit of cake to worship.

25. Similarly with the matter of not having been able for seven years to fulfill the Sunday obligation of assisting at Mass, not a hint of an apology was forthcoming.

Peculiar times!

26. Another way of rendering a sacrament invalid would be to get the form wrong and to get it wrong in such a way as to alter the meaning.

27. If instead of saying: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, I say: *I baptize thee in the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, I am altering the meaning of the form and rendering null the sacrament I set out to administer. I have done that by saying all the right words but adding others.

28. The Arians - 4th and 5th century heretics who denied that the Son was of the same substance as the Father - used a rite of Baptism that sounded: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father who is greater and of the Son who is less and of...* etc.

29. Anybody who emerged from that 'baptism' emerged unbaptized.

30. Our concern however is with the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist and specifically with the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist as it is mediated to us in the vernacular.

31. Has anything happened to it to make it invalid so that instead of the body, blood, soul and divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ being given at the Communion rail there is given mere bread?

32. Quite a few things have happened to it since the *Novus Ordo* Mass came in. There is no need to recount the frivolous and repeated tinkering (it has been changed three times) to which this, the most precious treasure consigned into our keeping by God, has been subjected to. It suffices to go straight to the original sacrilegious blow dealt this most sacred sacrament in which there is given us, not just grace but the very author of grace, our Lord himself.

33. The original blow was to alter the form to such a degree that it no longer signifies the *res sacramenti*. That blow was mortal. With the alteration of one word the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist, and with it the Mass, was destroyed.

34. The *res sacramenti* (i.e. the reality of the sacrament or the grace proper to the sacrament or the effect of the sacrament) of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist is, in the words of St Thomas: '*...the unity of the mystical body, without which there can be no salvation*'.[2]

35. This teaching of St Thomas was ratified by the sacred Council of Trent (1545-63).

In a chapter entitled "The Reason for the Institution of This Most Holy Sacrament," the Council of Trent had this to say:

> 'He (Christ) wished it (the Eucharist) ... to be a pledge of our future glory and everlasting happiness, and thus be a symbol of that one body of which he is head and to which *he wished us to be united as members* by the closest bond of faith,

[2] Summa Theologiae III, Q.73, Art.3.

hope and charity.'[3]

36. Prior to Trent, the Council of Florence (1439) expressed the same doctrine in these words:

> 'The effect of this sacrament, which is brought about in the soul of him who receives it worthily, is to unite him to Christ. .... (T)hrough this grace a man becomes incorporated into Christ and united with his members... .'[4]

37. The *form* of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist is:

> 'This is my body. This is the chalice of my blood of the new and eternal Testament, the Mystery of Faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.'

38. Both the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent specify the same identical form of words, as also does *De Defectibus* of the Roman Missal.

39. A change that alters the meaning of the form has been introduced into those words which are said over the wine. Instead of: *..which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins*, we now find the following: *It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven.*

40. To comprehend the damage which has been done we must identify in each form precisely what part of the form signifies the *res sacramenti*, that is to say, what part of the form signifies the unity (or union) of the Mystical Body.

41. To express that at greater length, what we are looking for is this: What in the form signifies that the person who receives this sacrament worthily becomes incorporated or more strongly incorporated, into the Mystical Body, that thus the bond of the communicant's union with Christ, the head, is solidified and strengthened? In other words, where in the form is the *res sacramenti*?

42. Similarly, what in the form signifies the strengthening of the close bond of spiritual union that exists between the communicant and every one of the many who are his fellow-members of the Mystical Body? In other words, as in the preceding paragraph: where in the form is the *res sacramenti*?

43. The answer to those two questions may be found by examining each part of the form.

If we take the ancient form first we can see that the first few words: *This is the chalice of my blood* do not signify the mystical body or the union of the mystical body but signify instead the body and blood of Christ, which, when the form is completed, are present really, truly and substantially.

44. The next few words: *Of the new and eternal testament*, do not bring out the signification of the Mystical Body either. These words contrast the sacrifices of the Old Law with Christ's unique atoning sacrifice of the New Law on Calvary, the mystery of mankind's redemption by the Son of God made man. What these words signify is true *propitiation.*

45. The next phrase in the consecration form: *the Mystery of Faith,* signifies the doctrine of the *real presence*, not therefore the Mystical Body.

---

[3] Trent, Sess.XIII, Ch.2 'Decree Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist'.
[4] Decree for the Armenians, from the Bull *Exultate Deo*, Nov. 22, 1439. (*Denz.* No.698).

46. Next in order, let us look at the words *which shall be shed.* These words quite obviously denote *sacrifice*.

47. What therefore are we to say of the only words left in the form? The only words left are: *for you and for many unto the remission of sins.*

48. The remission of sins is the necessary prerequisite for:

a. Our initial incorporation into the Mystical Body and

b. The reinstatement as living members, through what is called *The Second Plank after Shipwreck*, viz. the Sacrament of Penance, of those who have lost sanctifying grace.

49. Consequently, the remission of sins can be said to be the disposing cause of the union of the members of the Mystical Body, which union is effected by the actual reception, not just of grace, but of the very author of grace himself.

50. What of the words: *For you and for many*?

These words are to be found, some in Matthew, some in Luke.[5] It is to be noted that they do not derive from Matthew and Luke. They derive from tradition. Subsequently Matthew and Luke incorporated them into their respective Gospels. Mass was celebrated, the correct form used and transubstantiation effected before ever a word of the New Testament was written.

On that hear Cardinal Manning in his *The Temporal Mission of the Church:*

> 'We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them. Our faith was in the world before the New Testament was written.'[6]

51. The words: *For you and for many,* serve to declare the fruit of his passion. If we consider the value of the passion we see that the Redeemer shed his blood for the salvation of all, but if we look to the fruit that mankind has received from it we shall find that it pertains not to all but to *many* of the human race.

52. When therefore Our Lord said, *For you*, he meant either those who were present, or those chosen from among the Jewish people such as were, with the exception of Judas, the disciples with whom he was speaking. When he added, *and for many*, he wished to be understood to mean the remainder of the elect from among the Jews or Gentiles.

53. In this connection *The Catechism* by Decree of the Council of Trent, published by command of Pope Saint Pius V has:

> 'With reason therefore were the words ***for all*** not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did his Passion bring the fruit of salvation.'[7]

54. If therefore we were to identify, in the consecration form, the words which signify the union of the mystical body, we would be constrained to settle for the words: *for you and for many, unto the remission of sins.* The words *you* and *many* designate the members: the

---

[5] Matthew 26:28; Luke 22:20.
[6] London: Burnes and Oates, 1901.
[7] Pars II. Ch 4:24.

words *unto the remission of sins,* signify the principle of their unity.

55. Let us now examine the consecration formula (*form*) of the *Novus Ordo Missae,* as it presents in the vernacular. It reads:

> 'This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven.'[8]

56. There are obvious differences such as the excision of *Mysterium Fidei,* and the synonym *cup* for *chalice.* This latter difference seems of little import and does not presently concern us.

57. There is also the division of the form into sentences with the use of a full stop after *covenant,* the elimination of the relative pronoun *which,* of the immemorial form, and a beginning of a new sentence with the words: *It will be*...etc.

58. The division of the form into sentences is fraught with consequences which will need to be treated of, but not here and now, for our concern, presently, is with the *res sacramenti,* i.e. the grace proper to the sacrament, i.e. the sacramental grace or the special effect. The grace proper to the sacrament must be signified if it is to be effected.[9]

59. An analysis of the new form reveals that nowhere in it is there to be found signified the *res sacramenti.* The words *for you and for many unto the remission of sins,* which signified the *res sacramenti* in the immemorial form have been excised and other words, viz. *for you and for all, so that sins may be forgiven,* have been substituted in their place.

60. That substitution was and continues to be an egregious error. As long as it is around it is doing horrendous damage.[10]

61. It is impossible for the words *for you and for all* to signify the union or unity of the Mystical Body. It is impossible because *all* are not now, have not been, nor ever will be members of the Mystical Body.

62. Pope Pius XII instructs us, in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi,* as to who are members of the Mystical Body.

63. It may suffice to make mention of some who are not members of the Mystical Body, because if there are some who are not, then not all are.

64. Unbelievers and unbaptized persons are not members. Pius XII writes:

> 'Only those are really to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by legitimate authority.'

65. Heretics, schismatics and apostates are automatically excluded. Pius XII writes:

> 'Not every sin, however grave and enormous it be, is such as to sever a man

---

[8] Taken from the *Prayers of the Mass,* for use in New Zealand, from 3rd December 1990 to 30th November 1991.

[9] *Apostolicae Curae,* 1896.

[10] *A propos,* EWTN News in its Newslink for April 18, 1997 reported Cardinal Ratzinger as saying in his book '*From my Life*': The new Mass has done '*extremely serious damage to the Church.*' As long as it is around it is continuing to do '*extremely serious damage to the Church.*'"

automatically from the Body of the Church as does schism, or heresy or apostasy.'

66. Since this union of the Mystical Body is the *Res Sacramenti* of Holy Eucharist[11] it must be signified in the words of the sacramental form.

67. That is precisely what the 'sacramental,' form of the *Novus Ordo Missae* does not do. It does not signify the *res sacramenti,* that is to say, it does not signify the *union of the mystical body*, which is the *res sacramenti* of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist.

68. If the *union of the mystical body* is not signified by the words *(form)* of the sacrament, the effect, which is that same *union of the mystical body (res sacramenti)*, is not had. It is not had because: *the sacraments of the New law.....must both signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify.*[12]

69. If the effect is not had, that which presents as though it were a sacrament is in fact no sacrament at all. In a word, the 'sacrament' is invalid. As to this, Pope Leo XIII instructs us:

> 'That form ... cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify'.[13]

70. Pope Leo's warning means that the *form* of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist *'must essentially signify'* the *'union of the mystical body'*, if it is to be *'apt or sufficient for a sacrament'*.

71. In the *Novus Ordo Missae*, what purports to be the form does not do this. As a consequence the sacrament is not confected and the 'Mass' results invalid.

72. Now, quite remarkably, ICEL states:

> 'Neither "for all" nor "for many" should be considered to be incorrect translations of *pro multis.* In view of the considerations presented above, however, "for all" must be considered preferable in preserving the genuine significance of the original and for allowing the least possibility of misunderstanding.'[14]

73. This asserts, in the context of the Eucharistic form, two things,

1) *'For all'* and *'For many'* are both correct translations, and

2) *'For all'* is for various reasons preferable.

(One of these various reasons for *'For all'* being preferable is that Christ, according to ICEL, intended to say "all" in the ordinary sense of that word, i.e. meaning 'everybody', but was hampered, according to ICEL, by a absence of any word meaning "all" in the language Christ used. Concerning this, much is written in chapter 2, to follow.)

To survive, these two assertions, *1)* and *2)* above, have to nullify three massive authorities arrayed against them.

First Authority

---

[11] S. Th. III, Q.73, Art. 3.
[12] *Apostolicae Curae,* 1896.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] 'Note of Clarification on the Translation of *Pro multis* in the Eucharistic Prayers' in *'Documentorum Explicatio' Notitiae* 6 (1970) 39-40.

74. The first of these authorities is St Thomas Aquinas. In the *Summa Theologiae,* III, Q.78, Art.3, St Thomas inquires rhetorically: 'Is the form for the consecration of the wine, "This is the chalice of my blood etc." a suitable one?'

75. Amongst the objections which, according to his custom, he first advances, before responding affirmatively to the proposed question, he has as the eighth of nine objections the following:

> 'Christ's passion sufficed for all, while as to its efficacy it was profitable for many. Therefore it ought to be said: *Which shall be shed for all,* or else *for many* without adding *for you.*'

76. To expand that a little. St Thomas here refers to the passion of Christ. Of the passion of Christ he says two things. The first of these is: 'Christ's passion sufficed for all.' The second is: 'Christ's passion, as regards its efficacy, was profitable for many.'

77. He distinguishes thereby sufficiency and efficacy. The form is going to express either one or the other. If it should express sufficiency the form should read: *for all.* If it should express efficacy, the form should read *for many,* and without the additional *for you.*

78. St Thomas responds to the objection quite summarily. To begin with he goes straight into the efficacy aspect; he asserts that the blood of the passion of Christ is efficacious not only in regard to the elect amongst the Jews, to whom the blood of the old Testament was given but also in regard to the elect among the Gentiles.

As to the sufficiency aspect, he sails right over it, referring to it not at all, and goes straight to what Christ said. But what Christ said was limited to the efficacy aspect and, as may be inferred from what St Thomas said, expressly limited to the *elect.*

By referring not at all to the sufficiency aspect, St Thomas implied that the sufficiency aspect was extraneous to our concern. But St Thomas goes further than that, he reports what Christ did in fact say on the efficacy aspect, and what Christ said allows the inference that the sufficiency aspect is, in fact, extraneous to our concern. And at the same time he explained the reason for the additional *for you.*

79. Concerning what Christ said, St Thomas explains:

> *Ideo signanter dicit, 'pro vobis' Judaeis, 'et pro multis', scilicet gentilibus.....*

The adverb *signanter* means 'expressly,' 'clearly,' 'distinctly.' So, concerning what Christ said, St Thomas has: 'Therefore he (Christ) says expressly "for you" the Jews, and "for many" namely the Gentiles.'

80. To the original question therefore, viz.

> 'Is the form for the consecration of the wine, "This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which will be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." a suitable one?'

St Thomas replies affirmatively. He writes:

> 'The Church, taught by the Apostles, uses this form in the consecration of the wine.'

If a reason is sought as to why Our Lord should say *for many* and not *for all,* it must be confessed that there are many reasons. One of these is that Holy Eucharist is designed for the faithful. It is designed for and limited to the faithful, i.e. the members of the Mystical

The words of Pope Pius XII instruct us in this matter. In his encyclical *Mystici Corporis* he does not fail to mention the essential relationship of the Eucharist with the Mystical Body. He writes:

> '...in the Holy Eucharist the faithful are nourished and grow strong at the same table, and in a divine, ineffable way are brought into union with each other and with the divine Head of the whole Body.'

In the same encyclical, he states:

> 'Through the Eucharistic Sacrifice Christ Our Lord wished to give special evidence to the faithful of our union among ourselves and with our divine Head. ... For here the sacred ministers act in the person not only of our Saviour but of the whole Mystical Body.'

That this is perennial teaching is shown by St Thomas antecedently affirming the same doctrine.
In Q.79, A.7, *ad 2um*, he has:

> 'As Christ's passion benefits all, being sufficient for the forgiving of sins and the attaining of grace and glory, though it produces no effect save in those who are united to his Passion through faith and charity, so likewise this sacrifice, which is a memorial of the Lord's Passion, has no effect save on those who are united to the sacrament through faith and charity. Accordingly Augustine writes, "Who may offer Christ's body except for those who are his members?" And so the **Canon of the Mass makes no prayer for those who are outside the pale of the Church**' (*qui sunt extra Ecclesiam*).

81. The Sacrament of Holy Eucharist is **not** a sacrament 'for all men'; it is **the** sacrament 'for you and for many.' It results therefore that, contrary to ICEL's assertion, *for all* may not be held to be a correct translation, still less a translation to be preferred to *for many*.

Second Authority

The second of these authorities is The Catechism of the Council of Trent.

As reported above at No.72, ICEL asserts:

> 'Neither "for all" nor "for many" should be considered to be incorrect translations of *pro multis*.'

And further asserts that

> 'however "for all" must be considered preferable in preserving the genuine significance of the original and for allowing the least possibility of misunderstanding.'[15]

82. Those assertions may not stand before the Trent Catechism which explicitly rejects the substitution of 'for all' for 'for many.'

83. The Catechism has:

> 'With reason therefore, were the words *for all* not used, as in this place the fruits of

[15] T.1.1

> the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did his Passion bring the fruit of salvation.'

And explains:

> 'This is the import of the Apostle (Heb.9:28) when he says: *Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many*; and also of the words of our Lord in John (17:9): *I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them thou hast given me, because they are thine.*'[16]

84. A detailed analysis of the Latin text of the Catechism so far as it touches our subject matter is to be found in the first appendix to this chapter. It reveals that *for all* is not to be countenanced.

Third Authority

The third of these authorities is Pope Benedict XIV.

85. Pope Benedict XIV adhering to St Thomas Aquinas and the Catechism of the Council of Trent interpreted the words *pro multis* ('for many') in Book II, Chapter XV, par. 11 of his work entitled '*De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*'. What he says about *pro multis* will assist our understanding of 'for all'.

86. After dealing with St Thomas in the S.Th. III, 78, 3, he writes:

> 'And so, having agreed with the same Angelic doctor, we explain those words "for many" accordingly, though it is granted that (sometimes) the word "many", after a manner of speaking in the Holy Scriptures, may signify "all".'

Pope Benedict then refers to a verse in Romans 5, where without doubt the word 'many' does indeed signify 'all' (*Ubi sine dubitatione vox 'multi' omnes significat.*)

87. Returning then to the words *'for many'* in the passage in question which is from Matthew 26:28, he explains:

> 'Therefore we say that the blood of Christ was shed for all, shed for all however *as regards sufficiency* (Benedict's emphasis: *quoad sufficientiam*) and for the elect only *as regards efficacy* (Benedict's emphasis: *quoad efficaciam*) as the Doctor Thomas explains correctly: "The blood of Christ's passion has its efficacy not merely in the elect among the Jews, ... but also in the Gentiles ... and therefore He says expressly, *for you the Jews, and for many; namely the Gentiles*".'

88. It is apparent from the above that ICEL's assertion that 'neither *for all* nor *for many* should be considered to be incorrect translations of *pro multis*' does not conform to Pope Benedict's teaching on the matter.

89. It is worth mentioning that St Alphonsus de Liguori, Doctor of the Church, comments on Pope Benedict's explanation of St Thomas and is, not remarkably, in full agreement with both. He writes:

> 'The words *pro vobis et pro multis* (For you and for many) are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits: for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain

---

[16] 'The Roman Catechism. The Catechism of the Council of Trent.' Translated by McHugh and Callan. TAN Books, p. 227.

> number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (*sufficienter*) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (*efficaciter*) it does not save all - it saves only those who co-operate with grace.'

And adds:

> 'This is the explanation of St Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV.'[17]

The three authorities given above, dealing directly with the matter of *for many* and *for all*, explicitly reject the innovation *for all* because, among other reasons, it does not signify what Christ signified. Further, it signifies falsely.

90. All the foregoing argumentation considered, it appears that in any activity incorporating the *for all* mutilation, what started out as bread and wine at the beginning of whatever took place at the altar is still bread and wine at the end of whatever took place at the altar, more appropriately called now, since it bears only bread and wine, a table.

[17] St Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, 'The Holy Eucharist', p.44 of the edition published by the Redemptorist Fathers, 1934, translated by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R.

APPENDIX I

1. Unwilling to burden the foregoing text with an argument involving the Latin of the Roman Catechism, i.e. the *Catechismus ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos, Pii V. Pont. Max., Jussu Editus,* I have relegated to this appendix, the following:

2. An argument has been advanced to the effect that the ICEL imposition of 'for all,' though it appears to go contrary to the Roman Catechism, does not in fact do so. The problem, it is said, arises from the English translation of the Catechism.

3. A modern (1923) English translation of the Catechism reads:

> 'With reason therefore were the words *for all* not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did his Passion bring the fruit of salvation.' (Translated by McHugh and Callan. Tan Books.)

4. The original English translation, London, 1687, pp.206-207 reveals only differences of style:

> 'Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said "*for all*", seeing that in this place the design of the discourse extends only to the *fruits of the passion,* which brought the Fruit of Salvation *only to the elect.'*

5. The Latin from which the English translations above derive reads:

> 'Recte ergo factum est, ut *pro universis* non diceretur, cum hoc loco tantummodo de fructibus passionis esset, quae salutis fructum delectis solum attulit.'

6. It is to be noted that both the old and the modern translations into English are content to render the Latin original *pro universis* as *for all.*

7. However, the argument brought in aid of ICEL's *for all*, advances a subtle distinction. It asserts equivalently, or it leads one to infer that it asserts equivalently, that *for all* can mean some number smaller than *pro universis* while *pro universis* is to be taken to mean *for everybody*, i.e. *for absolutely everybody, no exceptions.*

8. If it does mean some number smaller than *absolutely everybody*, this different meaning will derive from something not expressed, not even implied, but nevertheless intended.

9. An example of this reasoning may be constructed by using the instruction given just before the recitation of the sacramental form for Holy Eucharist. That instruction reads: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes,* i.e. 'Take and eat all of you of this.' The term *omnes*, i.e. 'all', in that utterance, does not mean everybody without distinction but means, say, 'all of you who are present in this upper room,' or 'all who are seated at this table,' or some other limitation understood as a matter of common sense.

10. Similar reasoning, it is alleged, may be employed with the phrase 'for all' as found in 'for you and for all.' In this case the 'for all' is similarly to be understood as modified by some such qualification as 'for you and for all who accept my salvific act of sacrifice.'

11. It is alleged that the English translation, which reads: 'With reason therefore were the words *for all* not used, etc', does not render accurately, or at least precisely, the sense of *pro universis* and therefore does not apply to the *for all* in the ICEL sacramental form.

12. What is being affirmed is that *pro universis* and *pro omnibus* are to be distinguished on the basis that they express different meanings, at least in their respective contexts. *Pro universis* means absolutely everybody, whereas *for all* could mean absolutely everybody but

could also mean something less than absolutely everybody.

Concerning that there are several things to be said.

First

13. The relevant paragraph in the Latin - it is par.24, chapter IV, *Pars II* - of the Roman Catechism does not distinguish between the meanings of *universi* and *omnes*, but intends the same thing by *omnes* as it does by *universi*.

14. That is clear from the use of both *omnes* and of *universi* in the same paragraph in ways which reveal the use of either *omnes* or *universi* to be optional and rendering equally well the same signification, viz. 'everybody'.

15. Here, reproduced, is the whole of paragraph 24. I have rendered in bold, and underlined, the two terms *omnes* and *universi*, when they appear, and have added comment in parentheses, to show the availability and suitability of each of these two terms to signify exactly the same thing.

> 'Quapropter hoc loco apposite potius, quam in consecratione corporis passio Dominica commemoratur, his verbis: *Qui effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.* Sanguis enim separatim consecratus ad passionem domini, et mortem et passionis genus ante **omnium** (or *universorum*) oculos ponendum, maiorem vim et momentum habet. Sed verba illa, quae adduntur *Pro vobis et pro multis*, a Matthaeo et Luca singula singulis sumpta sunt, quae tamen sancta Ecclesia Spiritu Dei instructa simul coniunxit. Pertinent autem ad passionis fructum atque utilitatem declarandam. Nam si eius virtutem inspiciamus, pro **omnium** (or *universorum*) salute sanguinem a Salvatore effusum esse fatendum erit: si vero fructum, quem homines ex eo perceperint, cogitemus, non ad **omnes** (or *universos*), sed ad multos tantum eam utilitatem pervenire, facile intelligimus. Cum igitur, *pro vobis*, dixit, eos qui aderant, vel delectos ex Judaeorum populo, quales erant discipuli, excepto Juda, quibuscum loquebatur, significavit. Cum autem addidit, *et pro multis*, reliquos electos ex Judaeis, aut Gentilibus intelligi voluit. Recte ergo factum est, ut *pro* ***universis*** non diceretur, cum hoc loco tantummodo de fructibus passionis esset, quae salutis fructum delectis solum attulit. Atque huc spectant verba illa Apostoli: *Christus semel oblatus est ad multorum exhaurienda peccata*; et quod Dominus apud Joannem inquit: *Ego pro eis rogo, non pro mundo rogo, sed pro his quos dedisti mihi, quia tui sunt.* ... etc. ...'

16. In the third and eighth line in the quotation above, the word *omnium*, genitive plural of *omnes*, is used. It may be seen from the context that the author intended 'all' as in 'everybody' as in *universi*. In the ninth line, similarly, construing the sentence reveals that again, by the use of *omnes*, what is intended is 'everybody' i.e. *universi*.

17. It may be concluded that there is no difference in meaning in paragraph 24 between *omnes* and *universi*. It may be concluded that they are synonyms. When therefore the word *ergo* (therefore) is used in line 13 it means that as a consequence of all that has been explained before, *pro universis* is not said since in that place, only the fruit of the passion is intended. But all that which was said before, used only *omnes*.

18. The first time *omnis* was used in that paragraph it was used to affirm that the value of his passion was sufficient for the salvation of all, i.e. *pro omnium salute*. It is manifest from the context that *pro omnium salute* could legitimately be rendered, *pro universorum salute*.

19. The second time *omnis* was used it was used in connection with the fruit or efficacy of his passion and it was coupled with a negative to indicate that that fruit or efficacy is easily understood not to apply to all, i.e. *non ad omnes, sed ad multos tantum eam utilitatem*

pervenire, facile intelligimus. Again, it is manifest that in the second use of *omnis*, what is rendered *non ad omnes, sed ad* ...etc. could equally legitimately be rendered *non ad universos, sed ad* ... etc..

20. Further, if *universi* has a different meaning from *omnes* what is the function of the adverb *ergo* after the use of *omnes* in the text on the two occasions leading up.to the use of *pro universis*? If *universi* has a different meaning from *omnes* in this paragraph, that which precedes the adverb *ergo* has no connection with what succeeds it. That would be to reduce the whole text to something so vague as to be incomprehensible.

21. All that laboriously said, it results in any case that even *universi* can be qualified, even as *omnes* can be qualified. There is nothing to prevent one composing such a sentence as 'Take this all of you and eat' and render it as *Accipite universi ex hoc et manducate*, all the while intending only those in this room.

Second

22. From the use as seen in paragraph 24 of the terms *omnis* and *universus*, and analysed above, one can conclude that *omnis* and *universus* are synonyms. That conclusion is confirmed by consulting dictionaries.

23. Under the entry *omnis, e*, in *Lewis and Short* 'A Latin Dictionary' two synonyms of *omnis* are given. They are *cunctus* and *universus.* In the same dictionary, under the entry *universus*, one may read: 'Strengthened by *omnes*' and an example is given, viz.: 'Id genus hominum omnibus Universis est adversum.' a text drawn from T. Maccius Plautus, writer of comedy.

24. Under the entry for *universus* in the Latin-English Dictionary of St Thomas Aquinas, is to be found the information: 'synonym of *omnis.*'

25. It is apparent that the Roman Catechism argues against the use of *for all*, whether *for all* as in *pro universis* or *for all* as in *pro omnibus* and gives cogent reason in support. In paragraph 24 there is not to be found an *omnes* or a *universi* that means something less or fewer than *everybody.*

26. Given that Paragraph 24 is unequivocally given over to *all* meaning *everybody* would it nevertheless be possible to sidestep the argumentation altogether of the Catechism and use *for all*, but give it a context wherein its *all* is not *all* but something less than *all,* such as, say, *many*? This might be effected by incorporating in its use an unuttered limitation of the kind mentioned above, such as *for you and for all* <u>*who accept my salvific act of sacrifice*</u> and by that means circumvent the Catechism.

27. It would be impossible to bring such an undertaking to the desired term. It is not possible to transubstantiate mentally, i.e. by merely thinking and not saying the words of consecration.

28. If *for you and for all* is <u>said</u>, and, *who accept my salvific act of sacrifice* is <u>thought</u>, not said, an ambiguity is set up with the <u>spoken</u> words meaning natively what they mean, viz. *all* as in what is meant ordinarily by the word *all*, and the <u>thought</u> words importing a hoped for limitation to the spoken words.

29. Relevant to this is what the *Catechismus* has under the heading 'The Sacraments in General.' It is to be found at page 151 of the McHugh and Callan translation and under *De Sacramentis in Genere, Caput I* of *Pars Secunda,* paragraph 17, in the Latin.

The English reads:

'In this the Sacraments of the New Law excel those of the Old that, as far as we know, there was no definite form of administering the latter, and hence they were very uncertain and obscure. In our Sacraments, on the contrary, the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it renders the Sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt.'

30. Combining said words with thought words seems to be a long winded way of using *for all* but intending by its use *for many*. Further, that convolution would seem to intrude upon the intention of the celebrant, but I do not wish to explore that area unless I am forced to.

31. There is a letter on file written by a priest who, years ago, was aware of the invalidity problem posed by the *for all men* mutilation, but who thought he was required to say it when celebrating Mass. He rationalized that his intention was to say *for all* but the meaning he intended while saying *for all* was *for many*.

32. What he failed to advert to was that in each and every Mass celebrated, the words pronounced by the celebrant determine whether or not the Sacrament and the Sacrifice are performed or not performed. If the sacramental form is violated in any significant way there is no sacrament, no sacrifice, no mass at all.

33. Further, the example of the unuttered limitation or qualification is a superfluity. In the introductory example given at the beginning of this argumentation, limiting words such as *all of you who are present in this upper room*, were added to the words *Take this all of you and eat of it.*

34. There is no need for any such limitation. The second person plural imperative is perfectly adequate to identify the persons intended by the utterance. They are those persons whom the speaker is addressing, persons who, in other constructions, would be addressed in the vocative case.

35. If there is no need for any such limitation in the example offered as a model, why is that limitation imported into an utterance using the third person plural, as in *for you and for all*? Is it an example of 'damage control' in the face of ICEL's pertinacity? Especially when it is known - they published it far and wide - what ICEL intended, viz. *for all* as in **absolutely everybody.**

36. This whole affair is a contrived novelty engineered for no other reason than to save the words *for all* from invalidity. That a rescue operation should in the first place be deemed necessary is already sufficient to proscribe the use of the suspect form for in matters sacramental it is always the *via certa* which must be used, not the *via* merely *probabilis*.

37. As to understanding *for you and for all* in terms of the Latin typical edition, which has, as it should have, *for you and for many*, most of chapter 2 following treats of that.

APPENDIX II

Bishop Williamson of the St Pius X Society was sent a copy of *Res Sacramenti* (Watertight One), Chapter One, by someone who asked his opinion on the merits of the argument.

Bishop Williamson kindly reviewed the argument for his correspondent, found it wanting, and wrote a brief criticism of it, which eventually found its way to me. What follows is my rejoinder.

Bishop Williamson's refutation comprises two parts. I shall now identify the parts and proceed thereafter to respond to each part in sequence.

1. The first part deals with my alleged inversion of the three elements of a sacrament. These elements are: 1) *Sacramentum tantum* 2) *Res et Sacramentum* 3) *Res Sacramenti*.

2. The second part informs us that it is not universally accepted by theologians that all the words in the consecration form are necessary for validity, for many say that *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei* (This is the chalice of my blood) suffices.

Refutation. First part.

3. As to the first part, concerning getting elements round the wrong way, I have to say that what I have done is go from *Sacramentum tantum* to *Res sacramenti*, leaving *Res et Sacramentum* aside.

4. I left *Res et Sacramentum* aside because it is not germane to the thrust of my argument. That may become clear if I present in semi-tabled form an exploded view of the sacrament with which we are dealing.

5. Bishop Williamson has, in part, already introduced us to this with his:

Form (etc) > > > > *Res et Sacramentum* > > > > *Res*

6. By 'Form(etc)', in the line immediately above, Bishop Williamson means *Sacramentum Tantum*. And by *Res*, at the end of the line, he means *Res Sacramenti*

7. If I now expand that somewhat by putting in the appropriate verb, which is 'signifies', and by substituting *Sacramentum Tantum* for 'Form(etc)' and *Res Sacramenti* for simply '*Res*', we have:

Sacramentum Tantum **signifies** *Res et Sacramentum* **signifies** *Res Sacramenti.*

8. That semi-tabled form however is incomplete. It does not give all the parts of an exploded view of the sacrament. It leaves out the fact that *Sacramentum Tantum* has two significations.

9. One of these two significations is, as shown immediately above, *Res et Sacramentum.* The other is *Res Sacramenti*.

10. The *Res* of *Res et Sacramentum* is different from the *Res* of *Res Sacramenti.*

11. The *Res* of *Res et Sacramentum* is the true body of Christ, signified by the *Sacramentum Tantum* and signifying in turn (and therefore acting as the *Sacramentum* of the *Res et Sacramentum*) the *Res Sacramenti.*

12. The *Res* of *Res Sacramenti* is the Union of the Mystical body, signified by the *Sacramentum Tantum.*

13. If I were to render the whole of the exploded form we would be presented with the following two lines:

Sacramentum Tantum **signifies** *Res et Sacramentum* **signifies** *Res Sacramenti*

Sacramentum Tantum **signifies** *Res Sacramenti*

14. Bishop Williamson has argued as if I had been trafficking in Line One. If that, in fact, is his conviction, though a careful rereading of my text reveals nothing which could serve as a basis for that conviction, he could move from whatever he has read into my argument to conclude, though mistakenly, that I was, confusedly, going from *Sacramentum Tantum* to *Res Sacramenti* and then, backwards to *Res et Sacramentum.*

In fact, I went from *Sacramentum Tantum* to *Res Sacramenti* and there remained, making no further excursions.

15. It results therefore that all the traffic is in Line Two, where it is legitimate to go from *Sacramentum Tantum* directly to *Res Sacramenti* for the reason that the former signifies the latter.

16. Now it may be - the way Bishop Williamson has addressed my argument suggests that it is so - that Bishop Williamson takes no account of or makes no account of Line Two where there is affirmed the direct signification of *Res Sacramenti* by the *Sacramentum Tantum.* In case that is so, (it is not obviously so, but is, at least, faintly signaled), it will be helpful if I marshal some authorities in support of this signification in which the *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies directly the *Res Sacramenti.*

St Thomas puts it succinctly. In S.Th. III, 60, 3 he has:

> 'In the Sacrament of the altar, two things are signified, *viz.* Christ's true body, and Christ's Mystical Body, as Augustine says (*Liber Sent. Prosper.*)

17. In *Lib.IV Sententiarum,Dist. 8, Q.1,* John Duns Scotus has:

> 'Moreover, **the visible sign of the Sacrament has two realities, inasmuch as it signifies both of them and conveys the distinct symbolism of both.** For just as bread above all other food restores and sustains the body, and wine gladdens and satisfies man, so also does the flesh of Christ refresh and feed the inner man above all other spiritual gifts. ... And in like manner do **bread and wine signify the mystical reality, which is the union of the faithful.** For just as the one bread is composed of many grains of wheat and the wine is the product of many grapes, so does the unity of the Church [the Mystical Body] consist in many persons, namely, the faithful. (Emphasis added)

John Duns Scotus is saying here that the visible sign - that, of course, is the *Sacramentum Tantum* - has two realities. His reason for saying that the visible sign has two realities is because the visible sign is signifying those two realities and, further, conveys the distinct symbolism of both.

It is to be noted that when he says the visible sign signifies those two realities he is saying that the signification of each of the two realities is to be found in the visible sign, i.e. each of the two realities can be identified in the visible sign. It is not a matter of a sequence of two realities, one coming after the other and depending on the other, as in rain means wheat means bread means something on the table. It is instead a matter of two realities, as it were, side by side, as in rain means bread to eat and water to drink. That that is what he intends is reinforced by his saying that the visible sign conveys the **distinct** symbolism of both.

18. In *Cum Marthae Circa* (Denz. No. 415) Pope Innocent III writes:

> 'We must however distinguish precisely these three things which in this Sacrament are distinct and separate, namely, the visible sign, the true corporeal presence, and the spiritual effect or grace. The sign is in the bread and wine; the verity is in the Body and the Blood; the effect is that of unity and charity. The first of these we call the 'sign but not a reality' [i.e. the sign only]. The second is a 'sign and a reality.' The third is 'the reality but not a sign' [i.e. the reality only]. **But the first of these is the sign of two different realities.** The second however has a role as the sign of one reality, and also the role of itself being a reality. And the third element in fact is the reality that arises from this **double signification.** (Emphasis added)

19. Pope Eugene IV, at the Council of Florence, by means of his Bull *Exultate Deo* (Denz. 698), imparted the following teaching:

> 'The effect which this Sacrament has in the soul of a person who receives it worthily, is to unite him with Christ. Since it is by grace that a man is incorporated into Christ and united with Christ's members, it follows that those who receive this sacrament worthily, receive an increase of grace.'

20. The reference to 'this Sacrament' in the first line of the quotation immediately above of Pope Eugene IV, is a reference to the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist, by which is intended the *Sacramentum Tantum;* i.e. the matter and form, the sensible sign, efficacious of grace, instituted by Christ.

21. The references to the 'effect' and to an 'increase in grace' in the same quotation are references to the *Res Sacramenti* which is an effect and is a grace. Since this effect, this grace, is caused by the Sacrament, it results that the Sacrament, which is the *Sacramentum Tantum,* signifies and effects the *Res Sacramenti.* It has to be so because that is the way, namely, by signifying and thereby effecting, that Sacraments cause what they cause.

22. With all this in mind, we understand that Pope Leo XIII is stating that the *Res Sacramenti* (the effect, which is grace) is signified by the *Sacramentum Tantum* when he teaches:

> 'All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify.'

23. It is to be noted that when he uses the term 'Sacraments of the New Law' he is referring to the *Sacramentum Tantum.* That is clear because he speaks of them as 'sensible and efficient signs' which is a synonym for *Sacramentum Tantum.* When, then, he avers that they must both signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify he is referring to the *Res Sacramenti* which alone in all the elements of a Sacrament is a grace. That means that the *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies the *Res Sacramenti.*

24. Continuing the same quotation, Pope Leo elaborates further this idea by stating:

> 'Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite - that is to say, in the matter and in the form - it still pertains chiefly to the form; since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form.'

25. From this we learn that the signification of the *Res Sacramenti* ought to be found in the matter and that it ought to be found in the form. If the signification of the *Res Sacramenti* is

found in the matter and in the form, it follows that the *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies, and, of course, effects, the *Res Sacramenti.*

Via the Matter

26. As to the signification of the *Res Sacramenti* being found in the matter, a component of the *Sacramentum Tantum,* we have met this already in John Duns Scotus (No.17 above) who writes:

> 'Bread and wine signify the mystical reality [i.e. the grace, the effect, the *Res Sacramenti*] which is the union of the faithful [the Mystical Body]. For just as the one bread is composed of many grains of wheat, and the wine is the product of many grapes, so does the unity of the Church [the Mystical Body] consist in many persons, namely, the faithful.

27. Further to the signification of the *Res Sacramenti* being found in the matter, Pope Eugene IV in his Bull *Exultate Deo,* already quoted above at No. 19, gives us the words of his predecessor, the fifth Pope after St Peter, Blessed Alexander, who said:

> 'Not wine only nor water only should be offered in the chalice of the Lord, but a mixture of both. For we read that both, i.e. blood and water, flowed from the side of Christ.'

To this Pope Eugene adds:

> 'Finally, this is a **fitting way to signify the effect of this Sacrament, that is, the union of the Christian people with Christ.**' (Emphasis added)

Pope Eugene is saying that the mixture of wine and water, which is clearly a reference to the *Sacramentum Tantum*, signifies the effect of this sacrament. But the effect of this sacrament, he states, is the union of the Christian people with Christ. The union of the Christian people with Christ is quite simply the union of the Mystical Body, which is, precisely, the *Res Sacramenti* of this sacrament.

28. It is clear that the several authorities quoted above hold and have taught that the matter of the *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies the *Res Sacramenti.*

Via the Form

29. The *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies the *Res Sacramenti* also via the form. The form is: 'This is my body. This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which will be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.'

As has been explained elsewhere (*vide*: Watertight III, ch.1, No.54) namely, in the document Bishop Williamson is arguing against, the words which signify the *Res Sacramenti* are, in context, 'for you and for many.'

30. It results that the *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies the *Res Sacramenti* directly via the matter and directly via the form.

31. That the *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies the *Res Sacramenti* directly via the matter and the form, as the quoted authorities abundantly affirm, can be only because Christ, who instituted the Sacrament wanted it so. What then is to be said of a 'form', such as 'for you and for all' by which the *Res Sacramenti* is not, and indeed cannot, be signified? Some things are too obvious to require further elaboration. This is one of them.

32. By stating that the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite, namely in

the matter and the form, since the signification Pope Leo is talking about is the signification of the *Res Sacramenti*, he is stating that the *Sacramentum Tantum* (the matter and the form) signifies the *Res Sacramenti* (union of the Mystical Body).

33. From this we may infer that of the two significations of the *Sacramentum Tantum,* one of them is the *Res Sacramenti,* as stated at Nos. 8, 9 & 13 above.

34. Before leaving this topic it may be useful, by way of parenthesis, to examine and respond to what Bishop Williamson very briefly says at one stage of his refutation of my argument. He writes:

> 'The Holy Eucharist does not by signifying the grace of the union of the Mystical Body effect a valid consecration. Rather it effects the grace of union by validly consecrating, and it validly consecrates by signifying the Body and Blood of Christ to be consecrated.'

35. Bishop Williamson puts forward here three propositions. The first of these is:

> 'The Holy Eucharist **does not** by signifying the grace of union of the Mystical Body effect a valid consecration.' (Emphasis added)

36. That is a remarkable utterance. It is clear, unambiguous and emerges from conviction. As it stands it is contrary to Pope Leo XIII's teaching in *Apostolicae Curae*:

> 'All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify.'

37. Pope Leo's teaching allows the inference - in exact contradiction of what Bishop Williamson states - that the Holy Eucharist **does** effect a valid consecration, by signifying the grace of union of the Mystical body.

38. Further, Pope Leo's teaching requires one to confess that if the grace of union is not signified, that grace, not being signified, will not be effected. But this grace is the reason the Sacrament was instituted in the first place.

39. If this grace is not effected there has been **no** consecration. That conclusion is reinforced by Pope Leo's words:

> 'That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a Sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify.' (*Apostolicae Curae*)

40. It also runs counter to St Thomas Aquinas in various places of which *In 1 Cor. XI (lect.6)*, will serve as a representative example, viz.:

> '...all of these words [He is referring to the words after: 'This is my Blood'] appertain to the **effecting power of the form**.' (Emphasis added)

41. The second of the three propositions advanced by Bishop Williamson reads:

> 'Rather it [Holy Eucharist] effects the grace of union by validly consecrating.'

42. Construing this proposition as it stands and out of its context, it is unexceptionable. **Of course** Holy Eucharist effects the grace of union by validly consecrating. Effecting the grace of union by validly consecrating is the reason the Sacrament was instituted in the first place. But in its context, which is very sparse, it appears that something else is being affirmed by this otherwise unexceptionable proposition.

43. The something else which is being affirmed is that the designation of the *Res et Sacramentum*, (i.e. the true body of Christ) by means of the words 'This is my Body', 'This is my Blood' suffices to signify the *Res Sacramenti* also.

44. That that is being affirmed appears, first, from the contrast indicated by the word 'Rather', set up between Bishop Williamson's first proposition and his second proposition, and secondly by the third proposition advanced, viz.:

> '...and it [i.e. Holy Eucharist] validly consecrates by signifying the Body and Blood of Christ to be consecrated.'

45. The above analysis suggests something else too. It suggests not only that Bishop Williamson holds the opinion that the words 'This is my body' together with the words 'This is my Blood' suffice to signify the *Res et Sacramentum* but that they suffice also to transubstantiate the elements. If that is so, i.e. if he does hold that those words suffice to transubstantiate the elements, the other words, such as: '...of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, etc...,' following the core words or not following them, as the case may be, will not be considered by him as necessary for transubstantiation.

46. The matter of whether the other words are or are not necessary and to what degree they are necessary I shall address when dealing with the second part of Bishop Williamson's refutation, which, in his words and with his emphasis, reads as follows:

> ... it is <u>not</u> universally accepted by all theologians that <u>all</u> the words in the Tridentine Latin 'Hic est enim ..... in remissionem peccatorum' are necessary for validity of consecration. Many say that 'Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei' suffices for consecration.

47. But now, at this stage, before proceeding to deal with that matter, I wish to address the possibility - it seems strongly indicated - that Bishop Williamson holds that the designation of the *Res et Sacramentum*, i.e. the true body of Christ, by means of the words: 'This is my body,' 'this is my blood,' suffices to signify the *Res Sacramenti* as well.

48. Some do hold that opinion. They think to find support for this in the assumption that since God is the author of all grace, this would automatically fulfill the requirement that the grace of the Sacrament be signified.

49. Of course, if it is so that the designation of the *Res et Sacramentum*, by means of the words: 'This is my Body,' 'this is my Blood,' suffices to signify the *Res Sacramenti* as well, then there is absolutely no need for the words *for you and for many*, or for the words *for you and for all*.

50. Those words *for you and for many* or the words *for you and for all*, can be present or they can be absent and nobody need care. Nobody need care because, it is affirmed, the *Res et Sacramentum* is doing all the work (namely, the signifying of the *Res Sacramenti*) needing to be done.

51. Further, in that case, the words *for all* cannot do the horrendous damage I am asserting they most certainly do.

52. Clearly this overlaps with the second part of Bishop Williamson's refutation of my argument, but there are two elements that make this consideration worthwhile in its own right, at this stage. Those elements are:

<u>First Element.</u>

53. The words 'This is my Body', 'This is my Blood', signify the true body of Christ. There is nothing in those words alone, able to signify the grace of union. But the grace of union, i.e. the *Res Sacramenti* has to be explicitly denoted, as was explained by Cardinal Vaughan and the English Catholic hierarchy, echoing the Catechism of the Council of Trent, in the *Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*, which reads:

> 'Moreover, the signification must not be ambiguous, but so far definite as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind.'

54. If the signification of the *Res Sacramenti* must not be ambiguous, *a fortiori* the signification of the *Res Sacramenti* must not be completely absent. It is completely absent from the words *This is my Body* and *This is my Blood.*

Second Element.

55. It is of course true that God is the author of all grace, but he is not himself grace, he is God. Grace, he creates. Grace is a created supernatural quality, created for certain purposes. God's presence does not signify grace. God's presence signifies simply that God is present.

56. God is the giver and the principal **cause** of grace (the sacrament itself is an instrumental cause) and sacramental grace is the **effect**. An effect cannot be the same as the cause, or be contained in the cause as an integral part of it, for in such a case the cause would cause itself, which is impossible.

57. From this consideration it results that the presence of the author of all grace does not signify grace. The words themselves, i.e. *This is my body, This is my blood*, **by themselves**, do not suffice to signify the *Res Sacramenti*, i.e. to signify the grace of the sacrament.

58. If grace is signified, and it **is** signified, the signification derives from something more than those words, there has to be something else which brings to those words (i.e. the words: *this is my body, This is my blood*) the signification they do not natively convey. That something else, that source, needs to be identified.

59. The identification of that source requires a step by step clarification. To start the process of clarification it will be helpful to return to No.15 above where I state that it is legitimate to go from *Sacramentum Tantum* to *Res Sacramenti* because the former signifies the latter. The latter, i.e. the *Res Sacramenti*, will not be there if *for you and for all* is substituted for the correct words *for you and for many*, in the form of the *Sacramentum Tantum*.

60. The reason the *Res Sacramenti* will not be there is that the required signifying is not being done by what purports to be the *Sacramentum Tantum*.

61. The required signifying can be done only with *many*, it cannot be done with *all.* It cannot be done with *all* because *all* cannot signify the Mystical Body as has been demonstrated elsewhere, (*vide*: Watertight III, Ch.1, No. 61 *et sqs.*) and it is precisely that, viz. the Mystical Body or the union thereof, which constitutes the special grace, the sacramental grace, that is to say, the *Res Sacramenti*, of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist.

62. Further. If *all* is used in the form of the *Sacramentum Tantum*, not only is the required signification, viz. *many*, absent from the form, but that signification which takes its place, viz. *all*, is signifying falsely.

63. If the required signifying is not being done then nothing is being effected and that is so because:

'All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite - that is to say, in the matter and in the form - it still pertains chiefly to the form: since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form.' 'That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a Sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify. [Leo XIII, Bull: *Apostolicae Curae*, (1896)].'

64. It is not necessary for the correct concluding of my argument, but in the interests of tidiness, I note that the two significations of the *Sacramentum Tantum* are not one before or after the other, but contemporaneous.

65. If one fails, both fail.

66. If the *Res Sacramenti* is not signified by the *Sacramentum Tantum* (2nd line), there will be no *Res et Sacramentum* at all (1st line). Both the one and the other are signified by the *Sacramentum Tantum.* If it appears that one or the other is not signified that can be only because the *Sacramentum Tantum* is defective, as would be the case if, in place of: *for many*, there were to be substituted the words: *for all*, in the form.

67. I have said in Nos. 10,11,12 above, that the *res* of *res et sacramentum* is different from the *res* of *res sacramenti.* The differences do not finish there. Similarly the *sacramentum* of *res et sacramentum* is different from the *sacramentum* of *sacramentum tantum.* This latter is the matter and form. The former is the true body of Christ. The latter (the matter and form) signifies the former (the true body of Christ).

68. The *Sacramentum* of *Sacramentum Tantum,* viz. the matter and form, i.e. the bread, the wine and the words in Holy Eucharist, is what we ordinarily think of when we think of sacraments, viz. *Signum sensibile, efficax gratiae, a Christo institutum,* i.e. a sensible sign, efficacious of grace, instituted by Christ.

69. The *Sacramentum* of *Res et Sacramentum* is the true body of Christ. Of this, two things need to be said.

First:

70. The *Sacramentum* of the *Res et Sacramentum*, viz. the true body of Christ, is not a sensible sign. There is no sense which can discern sensibly, in the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist, the true body of Christ, which is the *Res* of the *Res et Sacramentum.*

Second:

71. The *Sacramentum* of the *Res et Sacramentum*, viz. the true body of Christ functioning as *Sacramentum*, signifies (i.e. is a sign of), according to commonly accepted doctrine, the *Res Sacramenti*, viz. the union of the Mystical Body.

72. How can that be? How can the true body of Christ, the head of the mystical body signify the mystical body? That is the matter first broached in Nos.56 and 57 above.

This is how it can be: synecdochically.

It can signify the mystical body only synecdochically, that is, by synecdoche as when the whole is indicated by a part, in this case when the head, a less comprehensive term, stands for the head and members, a more comprehensive term.

73. By the fact that the signification of the *Res Sacramenti* by the *Sacramentum* of the *Res*

et Sacramentum is synecdochal, there is signaled another fact, viz. that there must be somewhere a whole (the more comprehensive term) to which the part (the less comprehensive term) belongs.

74. A concrete example will serve better than an abstract description to illustrate the principle here being stated. A common example of synecdoche is: *Please give me a hand.* Everyone understands that a mere hand in the circumstances is useless. What is needed is the part (the hand) attached to the whole (the body). The synecdoche is intelligible because hands and bodies, in the nature of things, go together. To anyone who does not know that hands and bodies go together - a Martian, for example - the synecdoche does not make sense.

75. While it is clear that hands and bodies, in the nature of things, go together, it is not in the nature of things that physical bodies and mystical bodies should go together. When our Blessed Lord appeared to St Margaret Mary Alacoque, neither she, nor, had there been one, any fortunate bystander made privy in some way to what was going on, would have even remotely thought of the Mystical Body. The Mystical Body was not part of the revelation.

76. If the Mystical Body was there and it was intended by heaven that it should be perceived it would have to have been signaled in some way. If it was not signaled it would not be perceived. The fact of the matter is that it could not be perceived because it was not there.

77. Because physical bodies and mystical bodies do not, in the nature of things, go together, synecdoche is not available unless the Mystical Body, which is the *whole* on which the synecdoche is built and depends, is supplied.

78. It is supplied by the words *for you and for many* in the form. If those words, a component of the form, are not there, one is left, not actually but conceptually, with the true body of the Lord which presents as a *whole* in its own right, whereas, in the correct form, the form affirmed in Florence, Trent, Aquinas, *de defectibus et al.*, the Lord's true body is presented, by synecdoche, as part of the Mystical Body, a reality (i.e. *Res*) which is expressed by the form *for you and for many*.

79. With that in mind, consider now the bald utterance *This is my blood*, the short form. Anyone instructed in the matter knows that those words denote the true or corporeal body of our Lord. If the Mystical Body is not signaled no one is going to elaborate the term *body*, and the term *blood* and adorn either with a mystical body. Signaling the Mystical Body is precisely what the words *for you and for many* do. If the words *for you and for many* are excised and no words take their place, or other words not meaning the same are put in their place, then all reference to the mystical body is taken away.

80. If all reference to the Mystical Body is taken away, that means you do not have a sacrament, that means in turn that not only is the *Res Sacramenti* not there, which is obvious enough, but also the *Res et Sacramentum* is not there either because that which was designed to signify or function by synecdoche (namely, the *Sacramentum* of the *Res et Sacramentum*) lacks the *whole* (the Mystical Body, the *Res Sacramenti*) which gave the *part* (the head, viz. Christ) intelligibility.

81. Overlook, ignore, excise, deny, forget or otherwise marginalise the expression: '*Sacramentum Tantum* **signifies** *Res Sacramenti*,' which is Line Two in No. 13 above, and the consequence will be that Line 1 in No.13 above is drained of effect.

82. The *Res et Sacramentum* in Line One needs Line Two to be able to take the final step which is the step between *Res et Sacramentum* and *Res Sacramenti*. Not only that, if Line Two is absent, Line One does not even depart from its starting point (*Sacramentum Tantum*) let alone reach and linger at the halfway point (*Res et Sacramentum*) waiting for the

Sacramentum Tantum to signify the Mystical Body.

83. The *Sacramentum tantum* is unable to signify the Mystical Body if the form has all reference to the Mystical body removed from it whether by cutting out words or by changing them so that they mean something else.

84. If the words are not cut out and are not changed, and therefore remain as they were, but their function is misunderstood as would happen if it were thought that the words could be dispensed with or changed and no harm done, then, although transubstantiation would take place, the stage is set for some presumptuous innovator, as in ICEL, to wreck things by substituting *for all* for *for many*. Which, of course, is exactly what has happened.

Refutation. Second Part.

85. Bishop Williamson writes that 'it is not universally accepted by all theologians that all the words in the Tridentine Latin *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et eterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur, in remissionem peccatorum*' (which may be described as 'the long form') 'are necessary for validity of consecration.'

86. He continues: 'Many say that the words *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei'* (which may be described as 'the short form') 'suffices for consecration.'

87. The relevance of that observation is that not a few theologians hold that the words 'this is the chalice of my blood' suffice for validity. More, and of greater weight, hold that those words do not suffice, - in that connection it is enough to mention St Thomas and after him, all the Thomists unanimously up to Tommaso Cardinal Cajetan, O.P. who departed from the opinion of St Thomas and affirmed the short form, indeed Cajetan shortened the short form by holding that simply 'This is my blood' sufficed.

88. This opinion of his appeared in the edition of his 'Commentaries' published at Venice in 1533. In 1570 Pope St Pius V authorized a Roman edition of Cajetan's 'Commentaries' but explicitly commanded that that particular opinion, viz. that the short form suffices for validity, be expurgated.

89. It is not to be wondered at, that Pope St Pius V should have taken such an initiative. The role of St Thomas Aquinas is unique in the Church. Pope Leo XIII instructs us in this matter. In his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* he writes, among other encomia, the following exceptional tributes to the Angelic Doctor:

> 'The ecumenical councils have always been careful to hold Thomas Aquinas in singular honour. In the councils of Lyons, Vienne, Florence and the Vatican one might almost say that Thomas took part and presided over the deliberations and decrees of the Fathers.
>
> 'But the chief and special glory of Thomas, one which he has shared with none of the Catholic doctors, is that the Fathers of Trent made it part of the order of the conclave to lay upon the altar, together with the code of Sacred Scripture and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, whence to seek counsel, reason and inspiration.'

90. The view of St Thomas on the essential words of the wine consecration form is stated in three different places. They are: (1) *Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum*: (2) *In 1 Cor. XI (lect. 6)*: (3) *Summa Theologiae* III, Q.78. A. 3 *Respondeo...*

91. In *Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum* (dist.8, Q.2, a. 2. q.1, ad 3) one reads:

> 'And therefore those words which follow *[that is, which follow 'This is the chalice*

of my blood'] are essential to the blood, inasmuch as it is consecrated in this sacrament, and therefore **they must be of the substance of the form.**' (Emphasis added)

92. *In 1 Cor. XI (lect. 6)* has the following:

'In regard to those words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are necessary for the form, but the words *This is the chalice of my blood* only, not the remainder which follows, *of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.* But it would appear that this is not said correctly, because all that which follows is a determination of the predicate *[i.e. the chalice of my blood]:* hence those subsequent words belong to the meaning or signification of the same pronouncement. And because, as has often been said, it is by signifying that the forms of sacraments have their effect, hence **all of these words appertain to the effecting power of the form.**' (Emphasis added)

93. In the *Summa Theologiae* we find:

'I answer that, there is a twofold opinion regarding this form. Some have maintained that the words *This is the chalice of my blood* alone belong to the substance of this form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood, consequently they belong to the integrity of its *[i.e. the form's]* recitation.

'And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to the words *As often as ye shall do this*, which belong to the use of the sacrament, and consequently do not belong to the substance of the form. Hence it is that the priest pronounces all these words under the same rite and manner, namely, holding the chalice in his hands.'

94. Others of note in this matter of the short form and its inadequacy were the Discalced Carmelites of Salamanca, known as the *Salmanticenses*. They were unwavering adherents to Thomism, were dominant in 17th century scholarship, and effectively refuted the several arguments circulating at that time affirming the validity of the short form.

At this point, by way of parenthesis, I wish to address a matter, minor in itself, but proving a stumbling block to not a few, which left undealt with, drains of conviction those who, but for this matter, are persuaded that the long form is needed for validity.

To remove this stumbling block, it is necessary to enucleate the opinion of St Thomas Aquinas regarding the form of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist. It is not at all agreeable to find oneself of one opinion and St Thomas of another and contradictory opinion. So great an authority as the Angelic Doctor will eventually prevail or at least bring to a halt any exploration and promotion of an opinion contrary to his.

It seems at first sight that there is a difficulty in defining St Thomas' opinion, in one matter.

What we have read so far from three sources is manifestly of one mind. Further they span many years of composition and of teaching.

His *Scriptum super Lib. IV Sententiarum* was written between the years 1253 and 1259 and shows the words after *'This is the chalice of my blood'* to be essential to the blood and to be of the substance of the form.

His commentary on 1 Cor. 11, where he has: 'All of these words (that is, the words after the

words: "*This is the chalice of my blood*") appertain to the effecting power of the form', was written round about halfway through the period from 1259 to November 1268.

His *Summa* was written in 1266-68. In Question 78, A.3, he says that 'all the words which follow are of the substance of the form.' This agrees with what he said in *Scriptum super Lib. IV* and with what he said in *In 1 Cor. 11 (lect.6).*

Three sources, declaring the same thing in comforting unison. However, some people sound a jarring note. They say that in the *Summa* a difficulty is to be found. It is what he says in Question 78, Article 1. What he says there throws the reader - the superficial reader - into disarray.

Article 1 inquires: 'Is the form of this sacrament the words, "This is my body", and, "This is the chalice of my blood?"'

Having posed the question, St Thomas proceeds, according to his wont, to advance objections, four in this case, followed by the body of his reply to the question, followed in turn by his dismissal of the objections.

In the last paragraph of Art. 1, in the response to objection 4, a mere dozen or so paragraphs before Article 3 (both Article 1 and Article 3 could easily have been composed and written the same morning), a statement is made to the effect that 'If a priest were to say the aforesaid words, ("This is my body" and "This is the chalice of my blood") only, with the intention of confecting the sacrament, he would bring this sacrament to completion.' That is to say, he would succeed in transubstantiating the elements.

If nothing else of Article 1 is read, but only the words just now quoted, and one proceeds to Article 3 where it is said: 'All the words which follow (i.e. which follow: 'this is the chalice of my blood') are of the substance of the form,' a seeming contradiction presents itself.

In Article 1, 'This is the chalice of my blood' suffices for transubstantiation. In Article 3, '"This is the chalice of my blood ' does not suffice for transubstantiation, but the following words 'of the new and eternal testament etc.' are needed because 'all the words which follow are of the substance of the form...'

This is not just a contradiction, it is an incongruity, especially evident when one reads in Article 3, quoted above, that:

> 'Some have maintained that the words *This is the chalice of my blood* alone belong to the substance of the form, but not those words that follow.'

And then adds:

> 'Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood, consequently they belong to the integrity of its *[i.e. the form's]* recitation.'

Has St Thomas forgotten in the space of a dozen paragraphs that he is one (according of those who are moving this objection) of those who have 'maintained that the words *This is the chalice of my blood* alone belong to the substance of the form, but not those words that follow'?

Has he forgotten that back in Article 1 he said: 'If a priest were to say the aforesaid words (i.e. "This is my body" and "This is the chalice of my blood") **only**, with the intention of confecting the sacrament, he would bring this sacrament to completion'?

What to think of all this? Well, the first step to a resolution of this mere seeming problem is

actually to read Article 1, instead of dipping into it, here and there, in fugitive fashion. If it is read it will be seen that there is no problem.

The resolution of the 'problem' is to be found in a correct construing of Article 1 when it will be seen that Article 1 is not destructive of Article 3. It is not destructive of Article 3 because Article 1 is talking about something different from the concerns of Article 3. The two articles are addressing different matters.

A correct construing of Article 1 should begin with the word 'only' as in:

> 'If a priest were to say the aforesaid words ***only***, with the intention of confecting the sacrament, he would bring this sacrament to completion.'

The Latin text has:

> '...si sacerdos ***sola*** verba praedicta proferret cum intentione conficiendi hoc sacramentum, perficeretur hoc sacramentum.'

The word *only* is employed as an adjective in the Latin text and as an adverb in the English text. For practical purposes this is of no importance. Whether adverb or adjective the word must be understood to mean the exclusion of other words. But is this exclusion of other words the exclusion of **all** other words without distinction, or the exclusion of only **some** other words?

The context reveals that the word 'only' (*sola*) is used in the above quoted sentence to exclude only some other words. These words need to be identified. They will be words that St Thomas is addressing his attention to in this particular article, i.e. in Article 1.

There is no difficulty in identifying the words he is talking about. The words to be excluded, excluded, that is, from the form as not necessary to the form, are the words which precede the words: 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood.' St Thomas identifies them in the first objection, which begins his treatment of the subject matter.

The first objection asserts that it would seem that the words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' are not the form of this sacrament. It asserts that whatever may turn out to be the form of this sacrament it is going to be made up of the words Christ used to consecrate his body and blood. But, it continues, Christ first of all blessed the bread that he had taken. He used therefore words of blessing. Further, he went on to say, 'Take, all of you, and eat of this' and only then did he say 'This is my body,' and likewise with the wine. Hence, the words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' are not the form of this sacrament.

The implication is that the words of the prior blessing should be part of the form since they are words which Christ used in consecrating his body and blood.

The second objection would have the immediately prior words 'Take and eat,' similarly part of the form, on the supposed authority of Eusebius, who says that 'the invisible priest changes visible created things into his body, saying: take, eat; this is my body.' The second objection concludes from this that the whole of this phrase (take, eat; this is my body), would seem to be the form of the sacrament. Similarly with the words which refer to the wine.

Examination of the whole of Article 1 reveals there to be nary a word spent on the words which follow the core words, 'This is my body,' and 'this is my blood.' The article is simply not about the words: 'of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which will be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.' It is about the words which **precede** the core words.

The article inquires whether the preceding words, such as the words of the blessing, and such as the words 'take and eat ,' are to be considered part of the form, and concludes by means of argumentation that they are not to be considered part of the form.

In the light of that St Thomas can say that if the celebrant were to say the words, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' **only**, that is, **shorn of the preceding words** he has been talking about, the sacrament will be confected.

It results therefore that the exclusionary function of the word *only* is limited, by manifest intent, to the exclusion of the words which come **before** the core words. It is those words he is talking about. As already noted, nothing at all is being said in Article 1 about the words which come **after** the core words. The words that come after the core words are dealt with in Article 3, precisely where St Thomas intended they should be dealt with.

In Article 1 the Angelic Doctor is not concerned with determining what words are in the form but with what words are not in the form. That is to say, he is engaged in determining where the form of the Sacrament begins and, according to him, it begins at the words: 'This is my body' and 'This is the chalice of my blood.'

All this is so clear from a reading of Article 1 that it is a matter of no little surprise to find in a note to the same article to be found in the Leonine critical edition, published by Marietti (1948), the following:

> *Questio est, an verba 'novi et aeterni testamenti, etc.' sint de essentia formae, ita quod his omissis, non conficeretur sacramentum? Et controvertitur, etiam inter Thomistas qui disputant de mente Doctoris, qui videtur favere utrique sententiae.*

Translated this says:

> 'The question is, whether the words "of the new and eternal testament, etc." are of the essence of the form, so that, if they were omitted, the sacrament would not be confected. And it is controverted, even among Thomists who argue about the mind of the Doctor who seems to favour both opinions.'

The fact of the matter is that he does not favour both opinions. All one need do to be persuaded of that is simply to read what he wrote. With that I close the parenthesis.

95. But, be all that as it may, the matter is disputed; some say the long form is required for validity, others say the short form suffices for validity. Since there is a dispute and it is precisely a dispute as to what is required for validity, the fact of the dispute is thought to make any insistence on the long form, as necessary for validity, unsustainable. If grave theologians are to be found on each side, such a conclusion, viz. the conclusion that insistence on the long form for validity is unsustainable, seems eminently reasonable. The fact of the matter however is that it is not reasonable. Those who hold to the short form as sufficient for validity can be shown to be in error and on several grounds.

First Ground

96. Nobody may credibly hold to the sufficiency of the short form after 1896, the year Leo XIII's Bull *Apostolicae Curae* was promulgated. Those who hold to the sufficiency of the short form and Leo XIII cannot both be right. That is explained as follows.

97. Holy Eucharist is a sacrament. Leo XIII instructs us that a sacrament signifies what it effects and effects what it signifies. Since the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist is instituted to effect the union of the Mystical Body, that effect, viz. the union of the Mystical Body, viz. the *Res Sacramenti*, has to be signified. It has to be signified by the *Sacramentum Tantum*, which begins the whole process.

98. If the short form suffices to produce the body and blood then the *Sacramentum Tantum* is completed when the last word of the short form is pronounced. (At least, that appears to be what the 'Short Formers' are affirming, - see Nos. 102 and 106). That would mean that the Sacrament is complete at that moment and that in turn would mean that the subsequent words *novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum* are superfluous so far as the confecting of the sacrament is concerned, superfluous because the sacrament, as stated, would already be there.

99. Now if that is so, i.e. if the Sacrament is already there, that very reality for which the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist was instituted in the first place, viz. the union of the Mystical Body, though signified in the subsequent words ('for you and for many'), is not signified by the subsequent words ('for you and for many') so as to be effected.

100. Only the *Sacramentum Tantum* can both signify and effect what it signifies, other signs merely signify. They can do nothing more. They are unable to effect what they signify. Those following words: 'for you and for many,' by being unnecessary for validity, as some allege, are relegated to the category of mere sign, i.e. a sign that signifies but, unlike a sacrament, can do nothing more, cannot, in a word, *effect* what it signifies.

101. In brief, if the proponents of the short form are right, the *Sacramentum Tantum* is reduced to *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei*, i.e. it stands alone, without those words 'for you and for many' which both determine the predicate (*calix sanguinis mei*) and signify the *Res Sacramenti*, i.e. the union of the Mystical Body. That means that the bare form, *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei,* held out by the 'short formers' as sufficient for validity, does not signify the *Res Sacramenti.* No *Res Sacramenti,* no sacrament. No sacrament, no Mass.

102. The words 'for many' do come along, but they come along later, i.e. after and outside what the 'short formers' consider to be the *Sacramentum Tantum*, viz. the short form. Those words might as well not be there for all the good they can do or effect they can produce, once transubstantiation has taken place. Once transubstantiation has taken place everything has been done which can be done. Anything which follows thereafter is not *form* engaged in signifying sacramentally and thereby effecting what it is signifying, but mere *narrative* which does not signify sacramentally and, *a fortiori*, cannot effect what it is signifying.

Second Ground

103. Those who assert that the short form suffices may mean by that assertion one or the other of two possibilities. The first possibility is that they may mean no more than that if the short form is used and is not followed by other words, that is, if 'This is my blood' **alone**, is said, then transubstantiation takes place.

104. If that is what they mean then their assertion that transubstantiation would take place is wrong because the *Res Sacramenti* would not then be signified as is explained elsewhere profusely, but leaving that aside for the nonce and pretending that there may be some merit in affirming that the words 'This is my blood' **alone** (i.e. unaccompanied by other words) can result in transubstantiation, such an assertion reveals itself to be mere speculation and gratuitous speculation to boot and of no use or relevance whatsoever because the core words *This is my blood* are **never** found alone.

105. There is nowhere, nor has there ever been, a form composed of those words alone. There are always other words attached, as, for example,

> *... of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.* (Latin Rite)

or

> *... the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all*

so that sins may be forgiven. (Novus Ordo)

or

... of the new testament, which is shed for you and for many for the expiation and forgiveness of sins. (Armenian Liturgy)

or

... of the new covenant which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins. (Coptic Liturgy)

or

... of the new covenant which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins. (Ethiopic Liturgy)

or

.. of the new covenant, which shall be poured out and offered for the forgiveness of the sins and eternal life of you and of many. (Syrian Liturgy)

or

... of the new eternal covenant, the mystery of faith, which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins. (Chaldean Liturgy)

or

... of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. (Malabarese Liturgy)

106. Similarly with the Maronite Liturgy the form of which is identical with that of the Latin Rite, with this notable distinction that the form is said in Aramaic and, I mention in passing, uses the Aramaic word for *many*, viz. *saggi'an*, thus setting itself apart from the Gadarine rush to embrace *all*, a word also to be found in Aramaic, despite mendacious assertions to the contrary by ICEL and which, in Aramaic, sounds *kol*.

107. The second possibility is that those who assert that the short form suffices for validity may mean by that that the words *This is the chalice of my blood*, though accompanied by the words which usually follow, viz. *of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith: which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins,* nevertheless do not effect transubstantiation on the conclusion of the whole form (the whole form being i.e. the core words plus the additional words which always accompany the core words) but, rather, effect transubstantiation as soon as the word *blood* is pronounced in the clause *This is the chalice of my blood.*

108. All theologians, whether 'short formers' or 'long formers' admit that words added to the core words *this is my blood*, can alter the signification of the form for good or ill, i.e. to determine the predicate or to destroy it. Take, as an example a form which sounds:

This is the chalice of my blood, of the ***old*** *and* ***temporary*** *testament,*...etc....

109. Is there anybody who imagines that if such a deformation were to be visited upon the core words it would have no effect on the outcome? Who imagines that transubstantiation would take place the moment the short form *This is my blood* was pronounced, despite the utterance of the words *of the* ***old*** *and* ***temporary*** *testament* .. etc. .. immediately following the core words and in the very same sentence, creating a context and clearly determining the predicate *my blood*?

110. There may be somebody who so opines but it is unlikely. I suggest that such an opinion is so singularly singular that it may be left aside and not further considered. The use of that absurd example *of the* ***old*** *and* ***temporary*** *testament* and the wreckage it makes of the form, serves a valuable purpose in that, contrasting so starkly, as it does, with the correct words *of the new and eternal testament* it highlights the effecting power of the words which determine the predicate.

111. Precisely the question being agitated here is whether the words *for you and for many, unto the remission of sins* or the words *for you and for all, so that sins may be forgiven*

determine the predicate, that is, determine the sense of the preceding words and whether they (i.e. the subsequent words) are part of the *signifying* and *effecting* form.

That those words both determine the predicate and are part of the *signifying* and *effecting form* is the clear conviction of St Thomas Aquinas as may be seen in *In 1 Cor. XI (lect.6)* and others of his works, quoted above at Nos. 90-93. The fact that St Thomas so thinks should give anybody of a contrary opinion pause.

112. If they are not part of the signifying and effecting form, then we are left without a *res sacramenti*. That means no sacrament. If they are part of the signifying and effecting form then any changes, such as a change from *for many unto the remission of sins* to *for all so that sins may be forgiven* must be subject to the most rigorous examination, for if the change alters the signification, since sacraments effect what they effect by signifying, a change can render the 'form' void, that is, without effect.

113. If all theologians, whether 'short formers' or 'long formers', admit that words added to the short form can alter the signification of the form and if they are right in so holding that words added to the short form can alter the signification of the form, that alteration to the signification of the form can be only because the words added are taking part in the signifying and, ultimately, (if the form is adequate) effecting activity the form is engaged in.

Of course, if the form is inadequate, nothing is being effected

114. It becomes therefore a matter of concern whether the words *for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven* or the words *for you and for many unto the remission of sins* are used. It is a matter of concern because the two utterances do not convey the same sense, that is to say: they signify differently, but: *(I)t is by signifying that the forms of sacraments have their effect.* (*Vide:* No.92). The words *For all* abort the sacrament. The words *For many* bring it to term.

Third Ground

115. If the short form proponents are right when they say that the short form suffices for validity, then somehow or other, whether other words follow or not, the words *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei* (old form) or *This is the cup of my blood* (new form) have to be made to signify the union of the Mystical Body because the signifying of the union of the Mystical Body and the effecting of the union of the Mystical Body are necessary, since the union of the Mystical Body is the reason the Sacrament was instituted in the first place. Without it we simply do not have a Sacrament.

116. Neither the words *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei* (old form) nor the words *This is the cup of my blood* (new form) can be made to mean the union of the Mystical Body. But even if they could, that would be of no help to the short formers, because then the words would result ambiguous. They would then mean both what they natively mean, viz. the corporeal blood of Our Lord, and also what it would then be pretended they meant, viz. the union of the Mystical Body.

117. Concerning that the Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part II,17 has:

> 'In our sacraments ... the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it renders the Sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms such as exclude the possibility of doubt.'

118. The English Bishops in their 'Vindication of *Apostolicae Curae*' wrote:

> 'It is the nature of a Sacrament to signify what it effects and to effect what it signifies. Moreover, the signification must not be ambiguous, but...so far definite

as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind, as, for instance, the graces of other Sacraments.'

119. In this connection Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary has:

'The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. This power depends solely on the will of God, who has made the grace promised depend on the use of certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence the sacrament is altogether absent.'

120. Since the short form cannot be made to signify the Mystical Body, the short form results as without the *Res Sacramenti*, but in the words of Leo XIII: *That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify*. (*Apostolicae Curae*). A form which omits the *Res Sacramenti* is not sufficient for a sacrament, cannot produce a sacrament. No *Res Sacramenti*, no sacrament. No sacrament, no Mass.

121. For over thirty years Holy Mass has not been celebrated in all the vast expanse and reach of the Latin rite.

We are brought low in all the earth this day for our sins.

We have supinely allowed Satan's minions to manoeuvre us into abandoning the supreme treasure entrusted to us by God so that now, inermous, we stand before his divine Majesty without gifts, without sacrifice, without the means to placate and expiate that we may find mercy.

Nevertheless may a contrite heart and a humble spirit make us acceptable.

APPENDIX III

1. In the monograph *Res Sacramenti*, Chapter One, the statement is made, and supported by argumentation, that the mutilated form: '*For you and for all*' invalidates the Mass by not signifying the sacramental grace (i.e. the *Res Sacramenti*), which grace is the union of the Mystical Body.

2. Against this there was advanced at a Deanery meeting at which I was present, the objection that when one says *for all*, one is including *for many*, and that, it is said (hoped?), overcomes the problem.

3. In reply to that it must be said that that is not how sacraments function. Pope Leo XIII instructs us in this matter:

> 'All know that the Sacraments of the New Law signify what they effect and effect what they signify.' *(Apostolicae Curae)*

4. When a celebrant says *for all* it is immaterial that *for all* includes *for many*. The signification of *for all* is, precisely: *for all*. *For many* has a different signification. And when our Lord says *for many*, that is the signification he intends when he says, among other things, 'Do this ...', i.e. 'Do this which I have just done.' What he has just done is say and signify: *for many*.

5. When the celebrant says *for all* he indeed includes *for many*, but he also includes the *rest*. And including the *rest*, he intends to say and signify, and does say and signify: *all*, which results in an equation alien to the intent of the Sacrament, namely:

For many plus *the rest* equals *All.*

6. *The rest* is not signified when the celebrant says *for many*. Our Lord did not want to include *the rest*, he wanted to signify only *for many*, as is abundantly clear from absolutely every, without exception, source to be found, whether it be Sacred Scripture or Tradition, or Liturgical Science, or Liturgy and that whether in the East or in the West. *For all* is a calamitous novelty, foisted on the world these past thirty years, and only in the Latin rite.

7. Sacraments work by signifying. They work by signifying what the institutor intends should be signified. They do not work therefore by signifying what we might consider agreeable or appropriate or an improvement or conformable to the current fashionable aberration (universal salvation) or conciliatory towards our 'separated brethren', or near enough on the principle of 'She'll be right, Mate'.

8. Of the seven sacraments, two were instituted *In specie*. *In specie* in this context means that he gave us the form, i.e. what to say, as well as the matter, i.e. the material things to be used. The two instituted *In specie* are Baptism and Holy Eucharist. Change the meaning, and therefore the signification, of either of those two, and you wreck the sacrament.

9. St Thomas has, in this connection, the following cautionary word:

> 'The other point to be considered is the meaning of the words. For since in the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above, we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid.' (*Summa Th.* III, Q.60, Art.8).

10. The words *For all* change the meaning and therefore the signification of the form of Holy Eucharist and as a consequence wreck the sacrament, i.e. invalidate it.

11. If therefore the celebrant says *for all* he is certainly signifying but he is not signifying sacramentally. The only way he can signify sacramentally is to use the words of institution, i.e. the words given us by our Lord which were and are *for many*. Our Lord said *for many* because that is what he meant to say. Further, he said *for many* because he intended us to say *for many*.

12. In that connection there is something to note. In all the sacraments except Holy Eucharist the minister has an act to perform in addition to pronouncing the required words of the form. For example, pouring water in Baptism, anointing with chrism in confirmation, and in Holy Orders the imposition of hands, etc., which constitute the matter of that sacrament. But in the sacrament of Holy Eucharist the priest has no act to perform except the pronouncing of the necessary words (S. Th., III, Q.78, Art.1).

13. Moreover, the power of the form of this sacrament is derived solely from the fact that the words spoken by the priest are the exact words of our Lord. St. Thomas has:

> 'But the form of this sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this sacrament, except to pronounce the words of Christ.' (Summa Th. III, Q. 78, Art.1)

And also:

> 'Ambrose says (*De Sacram.*iv): The consecration is accomplished by the words and expressions of the Lord Jesus. ... When the time comes for perfecting the sacrament, the priest uses no longer his own words, but the words of Christ.' (*Ibid.*)

14. Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary has:

> 'The Council of Trent defines that though the Church may change rites and ceremonies, it cannot alter the "substance" of the sacraments. This follows from the very nature of a sacrament. The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. This power depends solely on the will of God, who has made the grace promised depend on the use of certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence the sacrament is altogether absent.'

15. Since the cause, Christ, is saying the words of the form through the instrument, the priest, it is incongruous that the instrument should take over and deform the form by introducing novel words not deriving from the cause. Since the novelty (*for all, so that sins may be forgiven*) introduced does not derive from the cause (i.e. from Christ, the institutor of the sacrament) and signifies something different from the form established by the cause (*for many unto the remission of sins*), the whole exercise cannot but result in invalidity.

16. That our Lord's mind was not to include *the rest* is suggested by his prayer pronounced just before the institution:

> 'I am praying for them; I am not praying for the world but for those whom thou hast given me ...'

and, of course, is indicated by his use of *for many*.

17. The authorities quoted in *Res Sacramenti,* Watertight III, Chapter I, Nos 74 *et sqs.* deal explicitly with this matter. Further to what there, in No.74, is quoted from the Summa III, Q.78, Art 3, the following, drawn from Q.79, A.7, *ad 2um*, is relevant. It reads as follows:

> 'As Christ's passion benefits all, being sufficient for the forgiving of sins and the attaining of grace and glory, though it produces no effect save in those who are united to his Passion through faith and charity, so likewise this sacrifice, which is a

> memorial of the Lord's Passion, has no effects save on those who are united to the sacrament through faith and charity. Accordingly Augustine writes, "Who may offer Christ's body except for those who are his members?" And so the **Canon of the Mass makes no prayer for those who are outside the pale of the Church**' (*qui sunt extra Ecclesiam*).

18. If the Canon of the Mass makes no prayer for those who are outside the pale of the Church, by what exercise of legerdemain have those outside the Church, viz. *the rest*, suddenly made their way into the very form itself of the sacrament?

19. The fact of the matter is that *the rest* have not made their way into the form of the sacrament at all. The result of trying to squeeze *the rest* into the form simply wrecks the form rendering it incapable of perfecting the sacrament. *For all so that sins may be forgiven* is not the form of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist.

20. Further, when the celebrant says *for all,* he is signifying falsely. He is signifying falsely, because:

First

21. Our Lord didn't say it, and he didn't say to say it. He said *for many*, and he said to say *for many*. What the celebrant has in front of his eyes when he says Mass is a book, a document. This document has - it is on page 40 of the one I am looking at at this moment -

> 'He gave you thanks, and giving the cup to his disciples, **SAID**: "Take this all of you and drink from it: this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you **AND FOR ALL, SO THAT SINS MAY BE FORGIVEN.**"'

22. The above formula says: 'He said....' and then gives us what he is supposed to have said. In reality he **said** neither **'for all'** nor **'so that sins may be forgiven'**. What he **did** say was **'for many unto the remission of sins'** as Matthew testifies in 26:28. Matthew, of course, was actually there at the Last Supper when our Lord said what he said.

23. Who are we to believe? Should we believe St Matthew who was there and who was inspired by the Holy Spirit to give the account of it later in his Gospel or should we believe a clutch of latter day, modernist innovators (read: ICEL)?

24. What the celebrant has before his eyes is a forgery. A forgery is the making of a false document, knowing it to be false, with the intent that it shall in any way be used or acted upon as genuine.

Second

25. *'For all'* does not signify the union of the Mystical body (*Vide*: Watertight III, Nos. 61 *et sqs.*) The union of the Mystical Body is the *Res Sacramenti,* i.e. the sacramental grace. No union of the Mystical Body, no sacrament! No sacrament, no Mass!

26. In this connection the Catechism of the Council of Trent has something stronger in the Latin than the usual English translation would lead one to think. The usual English translation has:

> 'The additional words *for you and for many*, are taken, some from Matthew some from Luke, but were joined together by the Catholic church under the guidance of the Spirit of God. They serve to declare the fruit and advantage of his passion. For if we look to its value, we must confess that the Redeemer shed his blood for the

> salvation of all, but if we look to the fruit which mankind has received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not unto all, but to many of the human race. When therefore (our Lord) said: *For you,* he meant either those who were present, or those chosen from among the Jewish people, such as were, with the exception of Judas, the disciples with whom he was speaking. When he added, *And for many,* he wished to be understood to mean the remainder of the elect from among the Jews or Gentiles.
>
> 'With reason therefore, were the words *for all* not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did his Passion bring the fruit of salvation.'

27. Construe the first and second paragraph of the indented quotation above, and you can see that the second paragraph, beginning with: 'With reason therefore ...', is a conclusion drawn from the paragraph preceding and shows why *for all* was not used. But compare the English with the Latin and it will be seen that the Latin is much stronger.

28. In the second paragraph the Latin employs a clause of purpose with the subjunctive to testify to an intention, on the part of the institutor, to have engineered things in order that *for all* might not be used.

The Latin of the second paragraph reads as follows:

Recte ergo factum est, ut pro universis non diceretur, cum hoc loco tantummodo de fructibus passionis esset, quae salutis fructum delectis solum attulit. (Emphasis in the original)

In inelegant but accurate English this means:

> 'Rightly therefore was done that which was done, **in order that** *for all* might not be said, since in this place it would be solely about the fruits of the passion, which passion brings the fruit of salvation only to the elect.'

29. With everything preceding the institution leading up, by design, to the use of *for many* and with everything preceding the institution conspiring to make it impossible to use *for all*, with a bi-millenial tradition of using *for many* and with every other rite without exception using *for many*, what did ICEL produce and foist on the world? That's right! **For all!**

Third

30. *For all* misrepresents the Mystical Body. The *Res Sacramenti* of Holy Eucharist is the union of the Mystical Body. Excise *for many* and simply leave a gap where those words were, means that the Mystical Body is not signified. The result of that is no *Res Sacramenti* which means in turn that the sacrament is not confected, i.e. the procedure followed has produced nothing. It was wine before, it is still wine after.

31. To excise *for many* and then, instead of leaving bad enough alone, to substitute in place of those words the words *for all*, means that the words *for all* are presenting as signifying the *Res Sacramenti*. Since the *Res Sacramenti* of Holy Eucharist is the union of the Mystical Body, the words *for all* are presenting as signifying the union of the Mystical Body.

32. *For all* **cannot** signify the union of the Mystical Body. To assert that *for all* signifies the union of the Mystical Body is contrary to the teaching of Pope Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis* (*Vide*: Watertight III, Nos. 61 *et sqs.*). *All* are not now, have not been, never will be, members of the Mystical Body.

33. On various other aspects of this whole question, much more can be written and *Deo*

volente will be as further chapters follow on from chapters one and two of *Watertight.* For example the right of the Church to change the substance of the sacraments (it has no right whatsoever) needs to be addressed. Similarly there needs to be described how the calamity of the Innovators dismantling the Latin rite and wrecking the Mass came about in the first place, but, at this stage, it may suffice to close this rejoinder to the argument that the words *for all* include the words *for many,* by pointing out a matter, minor compared to the forgery already mentioned, easily overlooked, of little significance in itself but symptomatic of the whole wretched scene. It is the matter of the words *for you and for all.* Those words contain a redundancy. If, whatever it is, it is *for all,* it is of necessity also *for you.* The rhetoric is inferior, but our Lord is said, falsely, to have said it.

APPENDIX IV

Monsignor Elliott, Episcopal Vicar for Religious Education in the Melbourne Archdiocese, was sent a copy of *Res Sacramenti*, (Watertight Three), Chapter One, by someone who asked his opinion on the merits of the argument.

Monsignor Elliott kindly reviewed the argument for his correspondent, found it wanting, and wrote a brief criticism of it, which eventually found its way to me. His criticism of it comprises four separate objections.. What follows is my rejoinder.

FIRST OBJECTION

Monsignor Elliott writes:

> 'I would point out that the argument is not at all watertight, in fact it leaks at the central point because St Thomas did not only speak of *Res Sacramenti*, he spoke of three distinctions.'

Monsignor Elliott then gives the three distinctions. They are:

1. *Sacramentum tantum*
2. *Res et Sacramentum*
3. *Res tantum*

Readers may not be familiar with the terminology used in distinction No. 3, which reads *Res tantum*. *Res tantum* is a synonym for *Res Sacramenti*. One is as good as the other but since the term *Res Sacramenti* is the term used throughout this whole work, starting with the title, I propose using only the term *Res Sacramenti* in what follows. Therefore, wherever *Res Sacramenti* is met readers are to know that it stands for *Res tantum*.

Monsignor Elliott does not argue that the argument has sprung a leak, he merely asserts that it has sprung a leak His assertion seems to depend on there having been no mention of *Res et Sacramentum* in the work he is reviewing.

It is true that there is no mention of *Res et Sacramentum*. There is no mention of *Res et Sacramentum* because there is absolutely no need or reason to mention it. It has nothing to do with the line of argument subject of Monsignor's review.

Because Monsignor draws a conclusion from insufficient premises, or, at least, from premises he has not revealed, I am unable to argue to the point until the premises are revealed. Without premises the assertion that the argument 'leaks at the central point' ('central' presumably because *Res et Sacramentum* is No.2 and therefore 'central' to the three distinctions) appears to me no more than a gratuitous assertion. What has been gratuitously affirmed may be gratuitously denied.

In the absence of premises, I am reduced to guessing what may be the connection Monsignor sees between there being three distinctions identified by St Thomas and a leak 'at the central point' of the argument, 'Watertight Three.' Until there is further elucidation, Monsignor's enthymeme is too spare to deal with.

However, the fact that Monsignor Elliott directs his attention to the absence of any mention of *Res et Sacramentum*, and presumably sees in that, something incapacitating or nullifying my argument suggests that he is labouring under the same misapprehension that appears to have guided Bishop Williamson's line of argument. (*Vide*: Appendix II of Chapter One.)

Bishop Williamson appears to have thought that:

expressed fully the reality which is a sacrament. He appears to have been unaware that *Sacramentum Tantum* has two significations, viz. *Res et Sacramentum* and *Res Sacramenti.* These two significations are immediate and synchronous, not mediate and serial That is to say: *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies directly *Res et Sacramentum* and *Sacramentum Tantum* signifies directly *Res Sacramenti.*

This matter is treated fully in APPENDIX II to Chapter One, specifically from Section 3 to Section 30.

SECOND OBJECTION

Monsignor Elliott writes:

> 'What this essay demands would logically lead to the nonsense of requiring that third distinction to be explicitly stated in the form of every sacrament. Therefore Baptism would only be valid if the formula was as follows:
>
> *I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit for the remission of sins and membership of the Mystical Body of Christ.*'

And at that point Monsignor refers, by implication and for the second time, to the absence of *Res et Sacramentum.* He writes:

> 'That is the logical consequence of the simplistic argument of this essay which fails to make St Thomas' three distinctions.'

Leaving aside the matter of the supposed deficiency of not importing all three distinctions of St Thomas into the argument, which I have dealt with above under the heading 'First Objection', the second objection needs to be addressed piece by piece.

To begin with it is not clear what is nonsensical about requiring that the third distinction, viz. the *Res Sacramenti*, be expressed explicitly in every sacrament.

Certainly if by the adverb 'explicitly' Monsignor intends 'developed in detail, leaving nothing merely implied' then such lengths would not be required at all, nor is such a requirement the logical consequence of not incorporating the *Res et Sacramentum* in the argumentation. There is no logical connection between one and the other.

But if by the term 'explicitly' is intended no more than 'expressly' or 'clearly' or 'definitely' then to express explicitly the *Res Sacramenti* in every sacrament is precisely what Pope Leo XIII required and was talking about when he said in *Apostolicae Curae*, the following:

> All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite - that is to say, in the matter and in the form - it still pertains chiefly to the form: since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form.' 'That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a Sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify.' [Leo XIII, Bull: *Apostolicae Curae,* (1896).]

If the required signifying is not being done then nothing is being effected.

Relevant to this is what the *Catechismus* has under the heading 'The Sacraments in General.' It is to be found at page 151 of the McHugh and Callan translation and under *De*

Sacramentis in Genere, Caput 1 of *Pars Secunda,* paragraph 17, in the Latin.

The English reads:

> 'In this the Sacraments of the New Law excel those of the Old that, as far as we know, there was no definite form of administering the latter, and hence they were very uncertain and obscure. In our Sacraments, on the contrary, the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it renders the Sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt.'

Monsignor Elliott then states as a conclusion that if the third distinction (i.e. the *Res Sacramenti*) has to be explicitly stated in the form of every sacrament, then the sacrament of Baptism would be valid only if the formula were: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the son and of the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins and membership of the Mystical Body of Christ.*

But that is not so at all. What is it, in a sacrament, that must be signified, in order that it may be effected? It is not every last effect but the principal effect, unique to the particular sacrament being examined, that must be signified. In baptism, for example, the principal effect which is inward justification is sufficiently indicated by the verb *Baptize*, as in *I baptize thee in the name of the Father etc.* As St Thomas states, the term *Baptize* means *to cleanse.*[1] It is obvious that we are not dealing with ordinary ablutions because these ablutions are in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

The *Res Sacramenti* is one, not multiplex. There are seven sacraments so there are seven unique effects, each one of which must be signified if the sacrament is to be effective, i.e. produce its effect.

The principal effect is variously known as the sacramental grace, the crowning effect of the sacrament, the power of the sacrament, the virtue of the sacrament, the grace proper to the sacrament and by still other terms, as for example the reality of the sacrament, i.e. the *Res Sacramenti* or the *Res tantum.*

The *Res Sacramenti* of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist, i.e. the special effect of that sacrament is not such as to be expressed by an entire litany, as it surely would be if every last effect had to be signified.

St Thomas was content to identify the *Res Sacramenti* of Baptism in the singular. He describes it as: 'Interior justification.'[2] He identifies the *Res Sacramenti* (he employs the term: *Res tantum*) of Holy Eucharist similarly in the singular and in these terms:

> '... the unity of the mystical body, without which there can be no salvation.'[3]

That St Thomas identifies the *Res Sacramenti* in the singular does not preclude there being many effects of the sacrament of Baptism and of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist. In addition to the *Res Sacramenti*, which in Baptism is *Inward Justification*, there are other effects of Baptism, such as the remission of all punishment for the sin or sins now erased. Another effect is incorporation into the Mystical Body which is necessary before Holy Eucharist, takes over, as it were, and intensifies the union of the Mystical Body.

The sacraments need to be distinguished one from the other. They are so distinguished by the *Res Sacramenti*, but what I may be permitted to call the 'secondary effects', i.e. all the

---

[1] *Summa*, III, 72, a. 4, ad 3.
[2] *Summa* III, 66, a. 1. *Respondeo in fine et Ad 1.*
[3] *Summa* III, 73, a. 3.

other wonderful and numerous effects of the sacraments are really effects of the primary effect, i.e. of the *Res Sacramenti*, viz. that which is signified and by being signified is effected.

The *Res Sacramenti* has, over all the other effects, that accompany it, a priority. It is not a priority of chronology, it is a priority of order, that is to say: it comes first, the way a father comes, not chronologically but with a priority of order, before the child he generates. There is no father until there is a child. There is no child until there is a father. Generator and the generated are contemporaneous but there is 'order' between them and the order is primary in the generator and secondary in the generated.

All the sacraments are related in some way to the Mystical Body, so there will be similarities, such as sanctifying grace, between one sacrament and another, but what distinguishes them unequivocally is the *Res Sacramenti*. And that has to be signified by the *Sacramentum tantum*.

The union of the Mystical Body is the *Res Sacramenti* of Holy Eucharist and that is expressed in the form by the words *for many*, but the same sacrament has other effects too, such as nutriment and preservation of the soul, remission of venial sins, a tonic and medicinal effect to preserve us from future evils, the extinguishing of concupiscence, spiritual refreshment, an increase of charity, etc.

The effects common to all the sacraments do not have to be expressed, that is to say, *signified*. It would not be necessary to express, for example: *Joy*, which is attendant upon the reception of every sacrament, but only the effect characteristic of the sacrament being considered. When we speak of ***the*** effect, only one thing is being referred to and that is the *Res Sacramenti*, the sacramental grace. That has to be signified because, as Pope Leo XIII instructs us:

> 'That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify.'

If what it must essentially signify is not signified there is no sacrament. If there is no sacrament there is no Mass.

THIRD OBJECTION

This is an objection calculated to sweep all before it. Monsignor Elliott writes:

> 'I can show you a series of formulae for Consecrating the Eucharist from Eastern Rites that do not include the words "for many" and "for the remission of sins." These Eucharistic prayers were obviously derived from those Gospel accounts which do not include these words. Are they therefore invalid?'

In advancing this objection, Monsignor Elliott is following in the illustrious steps of a formidable theologian, especially brilliant in moral theology, Juan Cardinal De Lugo, S.J. (1583-1660).

Cardinal De Lugo discovered certain ancient oriental liturgies that actually used only the few words: 'This is my blood', or a similar short form, as the complete sacramental form for the wine-consecration. He discovered these ancient short-form liturgies during his research seeking support for his own tenaciously held position. His position was that the short form sufficed for validity.

De Lugo argued, as Monsignor Elliott is arguing, or is at least implying, that the very existence of such liturgies proves that those few words are enough for validity and that by

that very fact the additional words of the form, although used universally in the Church, are not essential.

De Lugo's and Monsignor Elliott's argument will, in fact, sweep all before it if its underpinnings can withstand investigation. Because the validity of New Order Masses celebrated throughout the whole of the West for some thirty or more years is here being discussed, the evidence, so promising at first hearing, must be subjected to a rigorous investigation. If it passes the test the anxiety level of everybody concerned can subside. If the evidence advanced is shown to be faulty, the conclusion depending on it will emerge unproved and rightly be accounted as nought.

In Cardinal De Lugo's own time his evidence was weighed, analyzed and finally rejected by contemporary theologians. The best and most thorough rebuttal was made by the Salmanticenses. These were the Discalced Carmelites of Salamanca, Spain, held, according to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 'in the highest esteem, particularly at Rome where they are considered a standard work on Thomistic scholasticism.'[4]

Their *Cursus Theologicus*, written between 1631 and 1672, contains their reply against De Lugo. This reply comprises paragraphs 30-32 of Disp. IX, dub. 3 of the volume *De Eucharistia* which is volume XVIII of the *Cursus*. A translation, by Father Lawrence Brey, of paragraphs 30-32 is to be found in *The Remnant*, issue of July 31, 1976, pages 8 to 12, under the title 'The Salmanticenses' Response to De Lugo on the Form of Consecration of the Wine.'

Immediately prior to paragraph 30, the Salmanticenses refute a certain argument of Tommaso Cardinal Cajetan, O.P., who in his commentaries on the *Summa* contradicted the teaching of the Angelic Doctor by emphatically declaring that for the consecration of the Precious Blood nothing more is required than these four words: 'This is my blood.'

Cajetan asserted that: 'Although Scotus and many others doubt this is true, it seems to me that there is no basis for doubting it to be probable; but it must be considered beyond question, as I have said.'

This opinion of Cajetan's appeared in the edition of his 'Commentaries' published at Venice in 1533. In 1570, a Roman edition, authorized by Pope St Pius V appeared but without that opinion. It appeared without that opinion because Pope St Pius V had explicitly commanded that it be excised before being published. So much for its being 'beyond question'!

Having dealt with Cajetan the Salmanticenses turned their attention to De Lugo. They write in paragraph 30:

> 'Of no better standing (than Cajetan's argument) is another argument derived from Lugo (disp.11, sect.4) namely, that although in the liturgies we have adduced one finds those subsequent words which we have just discussed (i.e., *novi et aeterni ... pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*), nevertheless in other liturgies one finds only the five prior words (i.e., *Hic est calix sanguinis mei*): consequently from the aforesaid liturgies of this type it is evident that those words suffice. But in our considered opinion it is apparent that certainly if such five words should suffice, then God would have provided that the Church somehow would consummate the consecration form of the chalice by means of those same words, and no additional words. For indeed according to this argument (Lugo's) we arrive at that conclusion. That author (Lugo) claims that this is indeed the case. Here are his words: "Certainly in some liturgies" (such as used by the Maronites) "namely, of St John the Evangelist, of the holy Apostles, of St Eustasius, St John the

[4] Catholic Encyclopedia. Vol. XIII, p. 402, N.Y., 1012-1913.

Patriarch, the words are : *Hoc est corpus meum: Hic est sanguis meus.* In the liturgy of St Matthew the Pastor: *Hoc caro mea est: Hoc sanguis meus est.* These forms from the manuscript Missal of the Maronites, which was sent from Mt Libanus to Rome, were given to me by an erudite man, Victorius Scialach, Abbot of St Gregory, a Maronite from birth, and for many years a public interpreter of languages in the city of Rome." (End of quotation from Lugo.)

'This argument, we say, does not in the least demolish the fundamental position laid down by us; because our position assuredly relies only upon Scriptures, liturgies, or Masses of some certain (*certae*) authority and approbation. Those sources which do not have this certain authority and approbation ought to be spurned and reputed as nought. And of that ilk are those which Lugo adduces in the quotation just cited. For indeed, in the first place, Peter de Soto, Arauxo, Labat, and other men no less learned than he, testify that at first the Greeks and the Maronites used the same words in consecrating the chalice as those used by the Roman Church, or at least their equivalent. However, after the Greeks and their adherents became schismatics, just as they corrupted many canons of the Councils, as all Catholics recognize, so also they perverted not a few liturgies. Besides the malice of the schismatics and the heretics, there was at one time added towards the growth of this erroneous position the ignorance and carelessness of the transcribers; at another time the great catastrophe of the era, bringing the Greeks and the Maronites under the power of the Turks; at another time the distance and a diminishing commerce with the Romans; at another time, finally, the self-love and the excessive attachment to one's own opinions of those who did not neglect this means of overlooking the ancient form, in order to show that the prior words suffice. And from all these factors it came about that in the manuscript Missals of the Maronites prior to the year 1592 one may find some forms for consecrating the chalice that do not have the final words which we Latins use, and which it is certain that the Church of the Greeks once used.

'Consequently whatever is culled from such Missals, thus vitiated to that extent, has no firmness and authority. Secondly, because as N. Franciscus relates (*loc. cit.* no. 42), the most learned consultants among the Maronites at Rome replied that generally in almost all their liturgies (namely, of St Peter, of the Twelve Apostles, St John Chrysostom, St Cyril, St Eustasius, St John the patriarch, Pope Julius, and others) they have the same consecration form as the Latins, albeit with one word or another transposed, or if not explicitly expressed nevertheless implicitly contained in other words. Wherefore the Supreme Pontiff ordered the manuscript Missals of the Maronites that were in any manner corrupted to be corrected. And in accord with this mandate a Maronite Missal was printed at Rome in the year 1592 in the Medici printery. That Missal has in practically all the liturgies one and the same form for the consecration of the chalice. This form faithfully translated into Latin from the Syriac text reads: *Hic autem est calix sanguinis mei, testamenti novi, et aeterni, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis, et multis effunditur in remissionem peccatorum.* (This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which is poured out for you and for many unto the remission of sins.) And it is to such liturgies, of clearly certain authority, that one must direct one's attention, not indeed to those corrupted ones and apocrypha, not a few of which were cited by Lugo. For truly those must be estimated of no more value than the Scriptures perverted by the English, and others, in times of heresy and schism. For just as among those there were many Catholics who took pains to preserve the authentic Scriptures, there were also many heretics who strove diligently to corrupt them, distorting them into false meanings. So also among the Maronite inhabitants of Mt Libanus there were many Catholics, nevertheless there were at the same time many schismatics and those addicted to the errors of the Greeks. For which reason along with the legitimate liturgies and forms found in those manuscript codices there are not a few spurious ones of no authority, namely, those foisted by the

schismatics. And of that ilk are those forms which lack the latter words (namely: *novi et aeterni ... pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*), and in this respect they differ from other forms of universal and approved faith, which we reviewed in no. 28 *supra*. And for this reason the strength of our fundamental position cannot be nullified through this avenue of argument, just as the Catholic position neither can nor must be undermined by the Scripture versions corrupted by the English and other heretics.

'Perhaps one might contend that the Maronites at one time consecrated the chalice with only those words, *Hic calix est sanguinis Dei* (This is the chalice of the blood of God) or *Hic est sanguis meus* (This is my blood), and that it is contrary to reason that they would not actually have consecrated, i.e., by changing the wine into Christ's blood; because from that it would follow that they adored and exposed for adoration something which was not worthy of adoration; and likewise they would not have completed the sacrifice, along with "a thousand and one" other absurdities. If anyone should contend all the foregoing, we shall reply first of all that the Maronites do not in fact consecrate in that way, but rather in accord with the mandate and the correction of the form ordered by the Supreme Pontiff, as stated earlier. Just as in times past the Armenians were consecrating with other words and other formulas, but subsequently in the Council of Florence Pope Eugene ordered them to use the common form, i.e. the one used by the Latins, so also *de facto* the same case prevails with the Maronites as with the Armenians.

'However, granting the contrary supposition that at some time they in consecrating used only the five prior words, one could respond that they confected a valid sacrament, not because such a form would be sufficient according to the institution of Christ, but by reason of some extraordinary dispensation. For just as the Church gives jurisdiction to those who act with a probable opinion, or in "common error", so also can it be piously believed that God supplies whatever is lacking for the validity of the sacraments in the case of those who act with a probable opinion. which sort of matter is generally adjudicated in the Church; and similarly not a few believe that God supplies for a defect of intention on the part of a minister, as is evident from what we stated in an earlier tract (disp.7, no.37). But setting aside these predicated theories (which we do not approve of, for the reasons already stated), we do admit that the Maronites, or at least some of them, at one time (reportedly) used that form, *Hic sanguis est meus*, but consequently we say that by no means did they confect the consecration and the sacrament. That such a thing befell them we do not deem absurd. One may say that this would not seem fitting according to the disposition of Divine Providence, on account of a certain remarkable Divine Government that is universal in all respects. However, it would be by no means unfitting for Providence to permit the aforesaid error and its effects in some small part of the world peopled by the Maronites of Mt Libanus, and among some of its inhabitants, especially the ignorant and the schismatics, as some of them were. And that can be demonstrated by an example: for the Ethiopians sometimes used this form in consecrating: *Hic panis est corpus meum* (This bread is my body), as Verricelli observes in *de Missionibus*, tit.15, q.265, and nevertheless that form is plainly invalid, as all theologians concede. Therefore, just as it is not improper to admit that the Ethiopians (even though Catholics) did not validly consecrate in their extremely vast regions, so neither is it absurd to say that some few Maronites (especially schismatics or the ignorant, or those associated with schismatics), living in their small territory by sufferance of the Turks, had or endured a similar error, in consecrating the chalice with only those words, *Hic est sanguis meus*, and that other absurdities ensued from this error.

'From which it follows, firstly, that our adversaries (who are wont to prize so highly this argument from the Maronite liturgies and other similar evidence) actually demonstrate nothing; but they are even weighed down by [illegible]

granting that their opinion might be probable, they nevertheless cannot deny that our opinion is *most probable* and of great authority, as Suarez said (quoted by us *supra* in no.22). According to this our opinion, a consecration of the chalice expressed in these few words, *Hic est sanguis meus*, is invalid. And consequently whoever would attempt to consecrate using only those words would place himself in manifest danger of not consecrating and therefore of adoring and exposing for adoration that which is not worthy of adoration. And the Maronites were guilty of all those things, if it be true (as Lugo and certain others think) that they were employing those few words in consecrating the chalice. And consequently this conduct of theirs is incapable of establishing any authority; but, what is far more important, as it is so fraught with danger it should not even be spoken of approvingly. Particularly so, since our Most Holy Father Innocent XI, on March 2, 1679, *condemned* the following proposition: "In conferring the sacraments it is not illicit to follow a probable opinion concerning what pertains to the validity of the sacrament, while forsaking a safer opinion; unless law, convention, or the grave danger of incurring harm would prohibit it. Hence it is only in the conferring of Baptism and sacerdotal or episcopal orders that a probable opinion must not be used." Wherefore the Maronites cannot use that form, nor were they formerly able to use it licitly, unless ignorance might have excused them; for in using that form one places oneself in manifest danger of not consecrating, and of suffering the other consequences arising therefrom.

'Secondly, it so happens that our opinion and that of the Doctor St Thomas is, on the one hand, most probable, from a speculative point of view, and on the other hand it is the safer opinion and the one that must be wholly followed in practice. Whereas in reality our adversaries' opinion is solely speculative, and 'probable' from, as it were, a metaphysical point of view only, but it is totally devoid of any practical value, since it cannot be reduced to practice because of the danger of not consecrating.

'Thirdly, it so happens that what we have said about the Maronites' liturgies and similar rites of uncertain authority must be applied *a fortiori* to a certain liturgy by the name of "St Peter", in which precisely these words, *Hic est sanguis meus*, are set down as the consecration form for the chalice. For this liturgy is appraised as being wholly apocryphal, and it was first brought out (made public) by Lindanus, Bishop of Ghent, there being no evidence of it in the preceding centuries.

'Fourthly, it so happens that they err, those who say (as we insinuated in no.23) that the Doctor St Thomas taught our opinion by virtue of the fact that he had not been aware of those other liturgies, and that if he had seen them he would not have opposed himself to them, but would have been prepared to teach otherwise. They are deceived, we say, and they are lacking in the reverence due to St Thomas. First, because in the liturgies of any authority there is nothing that does not favour the opinion of the holy Doctor (as we considered in no.28). And he himself encompassed all these in the liturgy of the most excellent Mass of all, namely that of the Roman Church, which to his credit he expounded in his dissertation, *Sed Contra*. Also because in the other liturgies he sees nothing of importance that he would have found necessary to exclude. And, finally, because they are believed not to have existed at his time, but later were fabricated either by schismatics or by certain partisans, and those who were most diligent in promoting their own opinions. Just as there were those who, in the recent editions of the "Fathers" took the trouble to excise and remove certain passages from the Fathers, which were least favourable to their cause, and especially certain homilies of St John Chrysostom, so also, conversely, there were those who somehow concerned themselves with adding to the liturgies whatever might more favourably further their purposes.' (End of the Salmanticenses' text)

The preceding pages containing the text of the Salmanticenses advance, principally, five points.

1. De Lugo cites certain Maronite missals as 'proof' for the acceptability and sufficiency of the mere words, 'This is my blood', because these or similar abbreviated forms were found in those missals.

2. But those particular missals were actually corrupt and vitiated, products of a heretical and schismatic situation, hence have no value whatsoever as evidence on behalf of the 'short form' argument. On the other hand, the missals of the non-schismatic Maronites and all other bona fide Eastern traditions, incorporated the entire proper form, including the words equivalent to *pro multis.*

3. Moreover, the Roman Pontiff himself ordered the correction of the corrupted missals, and the insertion of the proper complete form.

4. If some of the Maronites used the corrupted forms, those particular Masses are considered invalid, despite theoretical pious beliefs that perhaps God's Providence would 'supply' for the defect (which hardly can be presumed and seems not in accord with the will of Christ in instituting the Eucharist and its absolute requirements); while '*Ecclesia supplet* would not apply at all, as it regards jurisdictional not sacramental defects.

5. The De Lugo short-form-sufficiency concept (whose probability was already outweighed by the teaching of St Thomas and arguments of the Salmanticenses later) is forbidden in actual practice, as it exposes such consecrations to the danger of invalidity, and counters the Church's directive that safer opinions must be followed in confecting the Sacraments.

It is providential that these Spanish Carmelites left records of their so thorough examination of this matter. Had they not done so the argument in defence of the validity of the short form, deriving from actual liturgies, at one time, it is supposed, in use, could easily have carried the day, rendering irrelevant the additional words: *novi et aeterni testamenti etc.*, to the huge undoing of the Church. Even so, the Church has been undone, at least in the West, by the *for all* mutilation.

Concerning the formulae not including the words *for many* and *for the remission of sins,* Monsignor Elliott inquires rhetorically: *Are they therefore invalid?* In the light of the above testimony and reasoning, the question may be treated as no long rhetorical but direct, to which the answer is patently: *Yes! They are invalid!*

FOURTH OBJECTION

Monsignor's final objection is rather a musing than an objection properly so called, but it has a certain weight. He writes:

> 'The so-called *Res Sacramenti* seems also to be lacking in some other sacramental formulae, pre-Vatican II and post Vatican II. I think Fr Meuli's argument is demanding too much of the forms of the Sacraments.'

In reply, rather than do the necessary research to identify the *Res Sacramenti* of each of the sacraments, it may suffice - I hope it will - to recall once more the doctrine of Pope Leo XIII in *Apostolicae Curae*:

> 'All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify.' (1896)

And to add the words of St Alphonsus de Liguori:

'Here is must be observed that in **all** (emphasis added) the sacraments there are three things to be distinguished, namely the "sign only" (*Sacramentum tantum*), the "reality only" (*Res tantum*) and the "sign and reality" (*Sacramentum et res*).'[5]

[5] *Theologia Moralis*, Lib. 6, Tract 3, Cap.1, dub.1, par. 189.

RES SACRAMENTI

CHAPTER II

INSTAURATIO LITURGICA

1. There are *prima facie* reasons for holding the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist as confected in the new Mass, and mediated to us in the vernacular, to be invalid.

2. One such reason is one particular change brought about in the form recited over the wine. The ancient form, translated from Latin into English, is:

> *'This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.'*

3. The new form, which exists only in the vernacular, has:

> *'This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven.'*

4. An earlier form had *for you and for all men.* This latter form survived into the '80's until a noisy, and noisome, coterie of feminists engineered its change. At the time, it apparently did not occur to anyone that the hated term *men* could have been effectively eliminated by using the phrase *for you and for many*, the phrase Our Lord used.

5. As explained previously the *res sacramenti* of Holy Eucharist is the unity or the union of the mystical body, without which there is no salvation. (*Vide*: Chapter I, No.34.)

6. The *res sacramenti* is signified, in the old form, by the words:

> *Which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.*

7. In the new form, there is nothing which signifies the *res sacramenti.*

8. The substitution of the words *for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven*, in the place of *for you and for many unto the remission of sins*, cannot refer to the mystical body because not all are members of the mystical body, but only some and those 'some' are 'many'.

9. Since sacraments signify what they effect and effect what they signify (Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curae*) a 'sacrament' which does not signify what it should, will not effect what it should. The form of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist should signify the *res sacramenti.* In the new Mass, it does not do that. The result is: no sacrament. In the case of Holy Eucharist, no sacrament means no Mass.

10. To this lamentable state of affairs there is applied an argument which is presented as saving validity.

Stated most briefly, (we shall go into it at length, presently), this argument asserts that the new form has to be understood as having the same meaning as the original Latin text of which it purports to be a translation. Since it does not mean the same as the original Latin text, right there is given reason for pause.

11. Is there some way by which that which says one thing may be made to say another? That needs investigation.

12. The first observation to be made is that understanding the new form in the light of the

old is not a gratuitous initiative, undertaken without colour of right. The necessary warrant for such an exercise is to be found in a Declaration, known by the first two words of its Latin text, viz. *Instauratio Liturgica*. It was promulgated by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 25 January 1974. (A copy of that Declaration is to be found in Appendix 1 to this chapter.) Three months after its appearing in the *AAS* it went into effect, i.e. it became binding (CJC, C.8:1).

13. It is alleged that from that date, or at least from whenever after that the Declaration reached priests at altars around the world, the English, which says and natively means something else, viz. *for all*, was to be taken to mean, thereafter, *for many*, as per the original Latin. The Latin of the Declaration reads:

> '*...sensum eiusdem secundum mentem Ecclesiae per originalem textum latinum expressum intelligendum esse.*'

14. The new Mass started in the United States in 1967. It started in New Zealand in 1972. It started in all other countries which presently have it, (China, I understand does not have it at all) a year, or several years, before 1974.

15. *Instauratio Liturgica* is not retroactive, nor does it treat of material able to be made retroactive (CJC 6 & 19:2).

16. In all those Masses using the new form prior to 25 January 1974 plus three months *vacatio legis*, after its appearance in the AAS, say, round about 25th April, 1974, priests were signifying in the vernacular: ... *for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven*. That is to say, they were signifying something alien to the sacrament of Holy Eucharist, they were signifying falsely and, as a consequence, were effecting nothing.

17. No *res sacramenti*, no sacrament. No sacrament, no Mass.

18. For some years therefore no Mass was said in the West.

19. What, however, about Masses said according to the new rite, subsequently to *Instauratio Liturgica*?

20. To ascertain the status of Masses said after the Declaration became binding, it is necessary to construe *Instauratio Liturgica*.

***Instauratio Liturgica* Construed**

21. The first step in construing *Instauratio Liturgica* is to identify what it may be. To that end we must examine the document itself. It is to be found in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* of 1974, at page 661. The document declares clearly what it is, it is a Declaration.

22. After the general heading: THE ACTS OF THE SACRED CONGREGATIONS, there is specified: THE SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. Then begins the text we are to construe. It begins with the term DECLARATION, heading the text and introducing it.

23. Right at the beginning of our study we need to know quite what is the import of a document called: Declaration.

24. A Declaration is a Juridical Document, distinguished therefore from a Magisterial Document. Juridical documents are distinguished into four levels, of which the first two, viz. 'Legislative texts' (level 1) and 'Administrative documents for the Community' (level 2) are of interest to us.

25. In Level 1, there are to be found 'Legislative texts'. These include the Code of Canon Law, Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, Apostolic Constitutions, Apostolic Letters given *Motu Proprio,* etc., etc.. These are laws (*leges*) in the strict sense.

26. In Level 2 are gathered 'Administrative Documents for the Community'. These are subordinate to 'Legislative Texts' , from which, ultimately, they derive their binding power. Norms contained in documents at this level "bind those who are bound by laws" (C.32, CJC 1983). These norms are laws in a derivative sense.

27. Amongst 'Administrative Documents for the Community' are gathered the following: General decree, Directory, Circular letter, etc. etc. and Declaration.

28. When, therefore we are dealing with a Declaration we are dealing with - in common parlance - an expression of law called administrative law.

29. Laws need to be interpreted. Both Canon 17 of the 1983 Code of Canon Law and Canon 18 of the 1917 Code, the code current when *Instauratio Liturgica* first saw the light of day, have:

> 'Ecclesiastical laws are to be understood in accord with the proper meaning of the words considered in their text and context. If the meaning remains doubtful and obscure, recourse is to be had to parallel passages if such exist, to the purpose and the circumstances of the law, and to the mind of the legislator.'

30. The introductory heading of *Instauratio Liturgica* reveals that it is a 'Declaration concerning the sense or signification to be attributed to approval of translations of sacramental formulae.'

31. The body of the text states that the reform of the liturgy has led to changes even in formulae which belong to the essence itself of the sacramental rites. It asserts that the new words resulting from these changes, as also the rest of each text, should have been translated in the vernacular tongues in such fashion as to express, according to the particular nature of each language, the original sense of the original text being translated.

32. The declaration states that several difficulties have arisen out of all this and reveals that these difficulties are coming to light now when translations are sent by Episcopal Conferences to the Apostolic See for approval.

33. It goes on to say that on account of this the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issues the reminder, once again, that it is necessary that the translation of essential formulae of sacramental rites render faithfully the original sense of the typical Latin text. And then adds: 'With that in mind the Congregation makes known: ...'

34. At this point in the Declaration one reads:

> 'The proposed translation of the sacramental formula in the vernacular tongue having been duly examined, the Apostolic See, when it judges the meaning intended by the Church to be rightly signified by the proposed translation, approves and confirms the translation, establishing in like manner the expressed sense of the translation to be understood according to the mind of the Church as per the original Latin text.'

35. If one is to give the proper meaning to the words of this piece of legislation, as required by the norms for interpretation in Canon 18 of the 1917 Code and Canon 17 of the 1983 Code, it can be seen that this administrative law is set up to deal with:

a) translations, not, however, all whatsoever translations but

b) translations from the original Latin, and

c) translations from the original Latin into the vernacular, and

d) translations of sacramental formulae in the original Latin, not excluding their contexts, and

e) translations which faithfully render the sense of the original text being translated.

(That the translations should faithfully render the sense of the original text being translated is expressed three times in the sixteen lines of this Declaration.)

36. If any one of the requirements from a) to e) inclusive, listed above, is not met, the Declaration *Instauratio Liturgica* may not be invoked. It may not be invoked because what purports to be a translation results without the necessary qualification for the application of the Declaration.

37. If the requirements a) to e) inclusive are met then the proposed translation has to be 'duly examined' (*rite examinata*). It appears from the context that to be 'duly examined' means to ascertain with rigour whether the requirements a) to e) inclusive have in fact been met and particularly whether the translation renders the sense of the original text.

38. Once the translation has been duly examined, the next step, if the procedure is to be continued with, entails the Apostolic See which judges the meaning intended by the Church to be rightly signified by the proposed translation. If the Apostolic See so judges it may approve and confirm the translation and, in like manner, establishes that the expressed sense of the translation is to be understood according to the mind of the Church as per the original Latin text.

39. Difficulties arose. The expectation that translations would express the meaning of the original text was not always realized. In consequence of this the CDF <u>again</u> (*iterum*) warns that it is necessary that the translations faithfully render the meaning of the original Latin text.

40. If it is necessary that the translations faithfully render the meaning of the original Latin text, it may be inquired: Why is it necessary? For what reason is it necessary? Why is this document saying that it is necessary? Is the document interrupting its legislative course simply to exhort would-be translators to be faithful translators? And then, having discharged the exhortation, picks up again the business of legislating?

41. That that is not so appears from the clause: 'With *that* (viz. the necessity that the translation of essential formulae of sacramental rites faithfully render the original sense of the typical Latin text) in mind, the Congregation makes known: (*illudque recolendo notum facit)* etc..

42. It appears that the only reason, so far as this document is concerned, why it would be necessary that the translations faithfully render the meaning of the original Latin text, is that unless they are translations and faithful translations, they will not come within the purview of the administrative law *Instauratio Liturgica.*

43. Unless the translation renders faithfully the meaning of the original Latin text it will not qualify for the application of the provisions legislated for faithful translations. What provisions are they? They are that a faithful translation will be:

a) approved and

b) confirmed and

c) have the meaning it expresses understood according to the mind of the church as per the original Latin text.

A Distraction

44. Now, before proceeding to demonstrate that that which is alleged to be the form of the English rendition of the sacramental formula of Holy Eucharist, is not a faithful translation of the original Latin and indeed is not even a translation of any kind but is instead a guess, and a mistaken guess at that, I must digress. It is necessary to remove what otherwise would be too grave a distraction to allow concentration on the argumentation I wish to advance.

45. The distraction may be phrased thus: Even supposing the English formula is not faithful, not a translation, not derived from the Latin etc. etc., the fact of the matter is this: the Church has actually approved it, after judging that it renders rightly the sense intended by the Church. What about that?

This about that.

46. Antecedent to all positive law there are what are called Rules of Law (*Regulae Juris*). They go back to the beginnings of law and are recognized everywhere. They *inform* the law as a soul informs the body.

47. Relevant here is the rule that a consent or approval arising out of ignorance or error (both the one and the other have the same legal effects) is null. That is expressed by the axiom: 'Errantis consensus nullus est' (*Liber 8 et 9 Codex de juris et facti ignorantia*), which reads: 'The consent of one in error is null.'

48. Approval does not heal the error in its root, as though approval provided a *sanatio in radice*. Approval does not make an error a non-error at the cost of the truth. That is expressed by the *Regula Juris* which sounds: 'Errore veritas non amittitur' (*Ulpianus, liber 6 pr. D. ad municip. 50,1*), which rendered word for word reads: 'By error truth is not lost,' or 'The truth does not cease, on account of an error, to be the truth.'

49. There is one only criterion by which a translation must be judged and that is whether it faithfully translates the original.

50. With regard to the approval of Vatican Congregations, even if confirmed by the Pope, Michael Davies writes in his *Pope Paul's New Mass,* page 612, that such approval in no way makes an erroneous translation correct. To those puzzled as to how a patent mistranslation could get through, he explains that where the Congregation for Divine Worship or the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith approve a translation it signifies that these Congregations have presumed that the national hierarchies have insured that the translation is orthodox and accurate, a perfectly reasonable presumption but proved, in the event, illusory.

51. Letters from such Congregations are frequently drafted by a minor official and signed by the Cardinal Prefect as a matter of routine. Where the Pope eventually confirms that approbation given by a Roman Congregation in a matter such as a translation, it is known as *Confirmatio in forma communi* and does not signify that the Pope has so much as seen the translation or even read the document he is signing.

52. Another *Regula Juris* in the same vein sounds: 'Nulla voluntas errantis' (*Pomponius, liber 20 D. de aqua 39,3.*) which means: 'In one who is in error there is no will.'

53. Because the New Mass form *for you and for all* purporting to render in English *pro vobis et pro multis,* is an error, an objective error, what is held out as approval of it is revealed as without legislative support and is therefore null.

54. The supposed approval, which has held all in thrall, has been able to survive only because the supposedly enabling legislation has not been understood in its text and context. The reason the supposedly enabling legislation has not been understood in its text and in its context is because it has not been read.

55. Not only is the supposed approval null, it is irremediable. No amount of legislation can change error into non-error. Such 'legislation' would emerge perverse. A perverse law is a contradiction in terms for law is a promulgated ordinance of reason for the common good made
by the authority who has care of the community.

Why *Instauratio Liturgica?*

56. What then is the function of *Instauratio Liturgica*? Is it inane law? Certainly not. It is a perfectly ordinary, undistinguished, but practical and useful norm. It could be described as good law. It is simply that it has been wrenched out of its intended use and has been applied, by those who know not what they do, to purposes for which it was not designed and which it is radically incapable of achieving.

57. It was not designed to refashion the English language, nor would it be capable of doing so, even had it been so designed. The English language is a 'given', a *'datum'. For all* and *for many* still mean, after *Instauratio Liturgica,* what they meant before - and in every context, not excluding the form of Holy Eucharist. Language is antecedent to law. It is antecedent to law because language is needed both to fashion law and to promulgate it.

58. Further, while men can make laws on matters on which they are competent to judge, i.e. outward and observable behaviour, they cannot pronounce on inward motions which are hidden (*cf. Summa* I, II, 91, 4 *ad* 3). *Understanding* (i.e. *intelligendum,* i.e. *requiring to be understood*), as in understanding the proposed translation of a sacramental formula in terms of the original Latin text, is not outward and observable behaviour but inward and hidden. Such a requirement is not within the reach of law.

59. If refashioning the English language and other languages in the same liturgical mess is not within the competence of *Instauratio Liturgica* what exactly is its competence? Why does it exist?

60. It exists for several reasons. One reason, germane to the issues being argued here, is that it makes provision for the exoneration of the approving authority if something absurd, such as *for you and for all* presenting as a translation of *pro vobis et pro multis* (for you and for many), were to slip through (D.V. I shall show later on how this did, in fact, happen).

61. That something absurd should slip through and emerge from the process with approval, does not mean that *Instauratio Liturgica* is automatically triggered and that the mechanism of being required to be understood in terms of the original Latin text, grinds into action. The Declaration is constructed with a view, among other goals, to avoiding precisely that dire and ludicrous consequence.

62. Quite apart from the necessity, as explained above, in section No. 35, that the translation has to be a translation and has to be a faithful translation, etc. in order that *Instauratio Liturgica* be applied, some things are so bizarre as to exceed the reach of the law. They have to be dealt with before law is framed, or, if already framed, before law is invoked. An example of that - there will probably never ever be a better - is precisely the matter with which we are dealing, viz. the presenting of *for you and for all* as a translation of *pro vobis*

et pro multis.

63. Another example, given for purposes of illustration, would be: *This is the chalice of my blood of the **old** and eternal testament.* That the word *old* can be made to mean, or be required to be taken to mean, ***new,*** in that formula, is a proposition for which I know of no authority. It enters the world of fantasy, where anything can happen, but that is certainly not the province of law which is an *ordinatio rationis.* If it is not the province of law it is not the province of *Instauratio Liturgica.*

64. That *old* can mean *new*, as it would be expected to do if *Instauratio Liturgica* were to be applied in the manner not a few erroneously think it can and should be applied, is an assertion for which there is no precedent in law. The only precedents of which I am aware are literary, as in *1984,* in *Animal Farm* with its *Newspeak*, and in *Through the Looking Glass*, where one H. Dumpty figures prominently.[18]

65. Though, as asserted in the previous paragraph, there is no legal precedent for the validation of the absurd, history attests to an attempt, which thankfully was overwhelmed by common sense.

66. Once upon a time an attempt was made to set legally the value of Pi. Pi is the name of a Greek letter which is used in mathematics to express the ratio of the circumference of a circle to its diameter. The approximate value of Pi carried out to seven decimal places (the decimals go on forever) is 3.1415927. Given any circle we can calculate its approximate circumference by multiplying Pi times its diameter, using for Pi the value of 3.1416. The formula is: c = Pi x d.

67. In the year 1897, Representative T. I. Record, of Posey County, Indiana introduced into the legislature of that great and sovereign State his famous House Bill #246. This bill provided that the value of Pi would be set legally at 4, or else 3.2 or some other nice number, easier to work with. Although using the value 4 for Pi might make some arithmetic computations a little easier, the answers to all mathematical problems involving Pi would be quite wrong, although 'legally' correct. Undaunted by such considerations Mr Record claimed in his bill that 'since the rule in present use fails to work...it should be discarded as wholly wanting and misleading in the practical applications.'

68. Although it was initially referred, for some mysterious reason, to the House Committee on Swamp Lands, - would that it had perished there! - the bill eventually reached the Committee on Education. That committee, after studying the bill, reported it back to the House with a recommendation that it be passed. And, indeed, House Bill #246 did pass when voted on by the House of Representatives of Indiana. It passed unanimously, 67 - 0. Next the bill was sent to the Senate. It got by the first reading with flying colours. On the second reading the Senate threw it out.

69. Thus was finally scuttled this landmark innovation which was designed to give relief to the citizens of Indiana from that older established rule which 'fails to work' and is 'wholly wanting'.

The misapplication of *Instauratio Liturgica* is reminiscent of the Indiana fiasco.

70. An example closer to our time and nearer home is provided by the New Zealand Law Reports. There is a provision in the Statutory Interpretation Act of New Zealand - it is section 5(j) - which enjoins one to accord to the implementing legislation to be construed

---

[18] '"When I use a word" Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean - neither more nor less".' Lewis Carrol: *Through the Looking Glass,* chapter 6, page 135. World International (1865)

such fair, large and liberal construction as will best ensure the attainment of the object of the legislation according to its true intent, meaning and spirit.

71. In *Sample v Sample* [1973] 1 NZLR 584, 586, Mr Justice Mahon, having been urged by counsel to use s 5(j) to hold that a husband could be the step-father of his wife's adulterous child, remarked that:

> '.. not even the most extreme liberality of construction can transform a wronged husband, by statutory metamorphosis, into the step-father of his wife's adulterous offspring.'

72. Not even the most extreme liberality of construction can transform, by statutory metamorphosis, the adulterous offspring (by ICEL out of Modernism) *for all so that sins may be forgiven* into the legitimate issue *for you and for many unto the remission of sins.*

73. Further illustration of matters which elude the reach of law because prior to law, is provided by an example drawn from the opinion of moral theologians, including St Alphonsus de Liguori,[19] the architect of Moral Theology. It was commonly taught to seminarians in the days when the Old Mass was said. This opinion holds that *Hic est enim corpus meum* (which means: *For here is my body*), is invalid.

74. The reason *Hic est enim corpus meum* is invalid is that sacraments signify what they effect and effect what they signify. If what purports to be a sacrament does not signify what it should and indeed signifies what it should not, it effects nothing. No amount of legislation will turn *hic* into *hoc*.

75. St Thomas writes:

> '... since in the sacraments the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey ... we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid.'[20]

76. And again:

> 'Now it is clear if any substantial part of the sacramental form be suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed and consequently the sacrament is invalid.'[21]

77. The Catechism of the Council of Trent states:

> 'In our sacraments ... the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it renders the Sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt.' [22]

78. The solemn teaching of the Magisterium, given by the Supreme Pontiff Leo XIII has:

> 'That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify.'[23]

---

[19] *Theologia Moralis,* Lib.VI, tract. III, Cap.1. Dub.VI, par.221: "Invalida erit consecratio, si dicas: *Hic* (adverbialiter) *est corpus meum.*

[20] *Summa,* III, Q.60, a.8.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Catechismus,* p 124:17.

[23] *Apostolicae Curae.*

79. In the formula: *... for all, so that sins may be forgiven,* there is omitted what should be signified, viz. *...for many unto the remission of sins,* wherein is found the *res sacramenti.* In this case the 'form' not only omits what it should signify but goes on to signify falsely.

80. The English Bishops, in their *Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'* write:

> 'The essential part must contain within itself all that is essential to the due conveyance of the grace or power attached to the Sacrament ... The essential part must 1) signify the grace or power to be conveyed; for, as the Bull tells us, 'it is the nature of a Sacrament to signify what it effects and to effect what it signifies.' Moreover, the signification must not be ambiguous, but 2) so far definite as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind; as, for instance, the graces of other Sacraments.'

81. A second level juridical document, viz. a Declaration - in this case *Instauratio Liturgica,* issuing from a subordinate legislative body, such as a Roman Dicastery,- in this case the CDF, cannot nullify Papal teaching such as is contained in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae.*

82. Further, even supposing, for the sake of argument, that *Instauratio Liturgica* could change error into non-error, one thing it cannot do is supply for what should be there and is not. It cannot supply for what is missing. That which is missing is the *res sacramenti.* It is actually absent from the English new form. That it is absent means that the requisite signifying is not being done. Willing, (i.e. exercising the will) to understand that signifying is being done does not make signifying happen. If the requisite signifying is not being done then neither is anything being effected, since sacraments signify what they effect and effect what they signify.

83. Let *Instauratio Liturgica* mold and fashion, within due limits, material that is there, but it cannot mold and fashion material that is not there. The *res sacramenti* is not there. It has been taken out. The only remedy is to put it back.

84. Further, if the Declaration is to be applied in the way uncritically and erroneously thought to be its function, viz. in the matter of our present specific interest, to make *for you and for all, so that sins may be forgiven* mean *for you and for many unto the remission of sins,* the law, i.e. *Instauratio Liturgica,* will always be at least one step behind.

85. It will be one step behind because *understanding,* as in *intelligendum esse* (see the last line of the Declaration) is subsequent to *signifying.* Nothing is understood which is not first signified. If the priest, *in persona Christi,* says and therefore signifies: *for you and for many unto the remission of sins,* the signification is complete and the sacrament is thereby confected. The sacrament is thereby confected because *sacraments signify what they effect and effect what they signify.*

86. If, on the other hand, the priest says, and therefore signifies: *for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven,* again, the signification is complete on the words being pronounced. But it is only then, in the second moment, that *understanding* can be engaged in.

87. Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary has:

> 'The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. This power depends solely on the will of God, who has made the grace promised depend on the use of certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence the sacrament is altogether absent.'

88. *Understanding* can be applied only to words already pronounced (or otherwise made

evident), and because already pronounced those words have completed their task of *signifying*. If the task of *signifying* has been completed it is immaterial and of no consequence whatever what somebody may *understand* thereafter. What somebody may *understand* thereafter will not affect one whit what has been already *signified*.

89. Neither will *understanding* beforehand, as it were in anticipation, affect anything. *Understanding* follows *signification*, not the other way round. It is the expressed signification which has to be *understood*, not the anticipated *signification* which, because it is anticipated, is not yet even in being.

90. The question arises: who is supposed to be engaged in this action of *understanding*? God? God has already made perfectly good arrangements in the matter by providing that there should be said: *for you and for many*. Is it for us to improve on those arrangements?

91. If not God, is it the celebrant who is to *understand*? What the celebrant *understands* is immaterial. All that is required of the celebrant for validity is that he intend to do what the Church does and that he proceed to do it. If he does that, he can understand what he likes.

92. Is it the Church which is to *understand*? The Church has made abundantly and repeatedly clear that the process of understanding is to initiate from a translation which faithfully renders the sense of the original Latin text.

93. In the case of: *For you and for all so that sins may be forgiven*, the formula in itself, which patently does not faithfully render the sense of the original Latin text, is not sacramental. It signifies what it signifies, but that which it signifies is not sacramental. Whoever it is who is to *understand*, perhaps God, or the celebrant, or the Church, can understand only what is said, because what is said, is the object of the activity of *understanding*.

94. That consideration shows up another difficulty arising from an erroneous construing of the Declaration. The *understanding* (as in: *intelligendum esse*) must be preceded by a preliminary judgment. This preliminary judgment judges that the word or phrase being considered is such a word or phrase, (e.g. *for you and for all*) as cannot be left on its own but must be subjected to being *understood*, in terms of the original Latin text. That is the first stage.

95. The second stage is then, subsequent to the judgment, actually to understand the word or the phrase in terms of the original Latin text. The *understanding* is now at the second remove from the *signifying*.

96. By the time the two stages have been completed the signification is already history, finished and done with. If the signification was sacramental the body and blood are there on the corporal. If the signification was not sacramental, subsequent understanding will effect precisely nothing.

97. Can the signification and the understanding be contemporaneous? Certainly not if the sacrament is being expressed, i.e. is *in fieri*, i.e. is in the process of becoming, as distinct from something in the pages of a text book on Sacramental Theology or from something being debated.

98. The expression has to be completed, i.e. the *form* has to be said, before it can be understood. But if it were possible for signification and understanding to be contemporaneous it would be the sacrament, if it is a sacrament, which would be doing the signifying (*Sacraments signify what they effect and effect what they signify*, and see Addis & Arnold's Catholic Dictionary quoted above at No.87), while it will be the person confecting the sacrament who will be doing the understanding. As stated above at No.84 and following, the understanding will be too late on the scene to effect anything.

It gets worse.

99. Construing *Instauratio Liturgica* erroneously, i.e. construing it as though its job was to alter the meaning of words, leads to the conclusion that the sacramental power, with which words not themselves natively capable of bearing and wielding sacramental power are to be invested, derives not from the supposed form itself, not from *Instauratio Liturgica,* not from the original Latin text of the sacramental formula, but from the act of the will made by the party, whoever that party may be, who wills to understand a text which does not reproduce the meaning of the original Latin text, as though it did reproduce the meaning of the original Latin text.

100. One priest (assuming it is the priest who has to do the *understanding* - he'll do as well as anybody else) can will to *understand* a sacramentally incompetent phrase (*for you and for all*) to mean a sacramentally competent phrase (*for you and for many*). That is what those who misconstrue *Instauratio Liturgica* expect priests to do. Those who misconstrue *Instauratio Liturgica* expect a valid Mass to issue from that exercise.

101. Another priest can simply not engage his will at all - it may not even occur to him to do so - or he may not know of the supposed need to do so, or, again he may positively engage his will not to *understand* the sacramentally incompetent phrase (*for you and for all*) to mean *for you and for many,* on the grounds, among several, that he is not engaged in cryptography but in the celebration of Mass.

102. If the erroneous construction of Instauratio Liturgica is not erroneous, but is instead correct, then these latter priests, viz. the ones who simply do not engage their will at all to understand and those to whom it does not occur to engage their will to understand and those who are ignorant of the supposed need to engage their will to understand and finally those who positively engage their will not to understand the sacramentally incompetent phrase *for you and for all* to mean the sacramentally competent phrase *for you and for many,* are celebrating invalidly.

103. In each of the above cases the *understanding* is missing, but it is precisely the *understanding* which is required to be present for the sacramentally incompetent phrase to be rendered sacramentally competent, according to the misinterpreters of *Instauratio Liturgica.*

104. There are other reasons for the existence of *Instauratio Liturgica.* One such is that it serves to bring to the attention of 'creative' translators the need to adhere to the original Latin text, the necessity and duty of which seems to have eluded the attention of people who could be expected to know better.

105. In truth, though, the people involved did know better. All the changes, **without any exception,** reveal an intention to achieve a goal, set *a priori,* to eliminate everything, in the liturgical expression of Catholic Eucharistic teaching, not acceptable to Protestants. This they have done with ruthless and horrendous efficiency, so efficiently indeed as to destroy the Mass and the Sacrament. There is more to be said about this matter, later on, in this study.

106. Another reason yet for the existence of *Instauratio Liturgica* is that faithful translations of the typical Latin text can be various. Here the Declaration acts as a filter admitting only translations faithful to the original text. It cannot admit translations not faithful to the original text, because these 'translations' do not conform to its stated criteria. In admitting only faithful translations it brings a certain order to the scene. That a calamitous error has been made is attributable to the human instruments engaged in the administration, not of the law, which comes later in the process, but of the preliminary steps which set the process in motion.

107. From No.53 above to No.106, immediately preceding, I have argued that the approval, assumed to have been given and thereby granting liceity to the new form, was itself vitiated and of no validity.

108. Now, as proposed in No.44, I shall address the matters raised in No.35.

Canon 18 of the 1917 Code and Canon 17 of the 1983 Code instruct us as to how we are to interpret ecclesiastical laws. They are to be interpreted according to the proper meaning of their words considered in their text and context.

109. Following those instructions in the construing of *Instauratio Liturgica* leads to certain conclusions, already listed in No.35 above, viz. that this piece of administrative law was promulgated to cover:

a) Translations; not however, any whatsoever translations but

b) Translations from the original Latin and

c) Translations from the original Latin into the vernacular and

d) Translations of sacramental formulae in the original Latin, not excluding their contexts; and

e) Translations which faithfully render the sense of the original text being translated.

Not a Translation

110. Concerning No. 109 a) above, if it transpires that the work being examined is not a translation, i.e. if it is not the result of a turning of one language into another, retaining the sense, then the provisions of *Instauratio Liturgica* are not applicable.

111. *Notitiae* 1968, pp.156 *et sqs* presents a decree and four Eucharistic Prayers of which numbers II, III and IV, prepared by *Consilium* at the command of the Supreme Pontiff, are new. As to Eucharistic Prayer I, (i.e. the Roman Canon), *Notitiae*, instead of reproducing the text, which was available then, everywhere, has, under the heading *Prex Eucharistica I, seu Canon Romanus*, the simple legend: *Ut in Missali Romano*, i.e. 'As in the Roman Missal.' It results therefore that *de jure* no change has taken place in the Latin of the immemorial Mass. *De facto* the ICEL vandals have laid waste the entire territory.

112. Comparing what purports to be the English translation of the Roman Canon with the original Latin text reveals departures so numerous as to astonish. And also to dismay. Dismay because the task of listing and describing the departures from the original Latin text is simply too big for one of limited resources of time and energy. I shall have to leave that work to one of more resolute will and content myself with giving, thankful to be able to do so, on this matter, what others, principally Michael Davies, in his invaluable work *Pope Paul's New Mass,* have already written after exhaustive investigation.

113. *'The ancient and venerable text of the Roman Canon has been mutilated beyond recognition.'* Thus the Editor of *The Tablet*, Douglas Woodruff, one of the most erudite Catholic laymen of the time in the English-speaking world, in an editorial entitled *Lingua Deserta* in the issue of 2 December 1967.

114. He wrote:

'It passes comprehension that the bishops of this country should have accepted

> even provisionally, this so-called translation of the Canon which is shortly to be heard in our churches. Nobody who studies it line by line with the original can fail to notice that it is a prime example of that 'desacralization' against which the Pope has warned the Church.'

115. He explains:

> 'The ruling idea seems to have been to see how much could be cut out on any pretext or none. This is certainly not what Rome had in mind when it demanded a version "without mutilations or simplifications of any kind".'

116. Christopher Monckton, editor of *The Universe* and a Latin scholar, in an editorial in the issue of 9 November 1979, condemned the dilution of important doctrinal teaching in the ICEL translation, which, he said, contains hundreds of glaring errors gravely distorting the meaning of the original Latin. This accusation provoked a furious reaction from the liturgical establishment which challenged Mr Monckton to substantiate his charge. He substantiated it immediately. He offered a list of four hundred errors to anyone requesting it.

117. Concerning those errors he wrote:

> 'It is immediately obvious on examination of the list that more than half the errors on it are errors of omission: words, phrases, sentences and sometime whole paragraphs are left out. By contrast, very few additions have been made: and one or two of these insertions have no small significance.'

118. He further states:

> 'The perpetration of as many as four hundred errors cannot be put down either to accident or carelessness on the part of the translators.'

119. From there he moves to identify a calculated policy behind what he stigmatizes as 'a conspiracy of errors.' He shows that these errors were not haphazard, were not the result of incompetence, but were deliberate. He identifies the animus. He writes:

> 'The errors display a common theme which reveals the intentions of the translators. That theme is the dilution or removal of allusions and references to those doctrines of the Mass which are specifically and peculiarly Catholic ... The thoroughness and determination with which those teachings which distinguish Catholic beliefs from those of other Christians have been removed is demonstrated by many minor omissions which are often repeated.'

Here follow a few of the more serious examples, drawn from Mr Monckton's editorial:

First Example:

120. In the new rite there are some unequivocal references to the sacrificial victim: *Hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae aeternae.*

This reference occurs in Canon I. It plainly identifies the Sacrificial Victim with the Bread of Life; and it means: *A pure victim, a holy victim, an unblemished victim, the holy Bread of eternal life.*

It is translated thus: *This holy and perfect sacrifice: the Bread of life.*

121. The word *hostia,* which means 'a sacrificial victim', is translated simply as 'sacrifice'. *Hostia* can be used metonymically to mean 'sacrifice' but its primary meaning is 'sacrificial

victim'. The ICEL translators nearly always render *hostia* as 'sacrifice' because 'sacrifice' can mean nothing more than a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving as opposed to the Sacrifice of Christ, the living Victim.

122. In Canon I, however, there is a point at which the words *sacrificium* (a sacrifice) and *hostia* (a victim) occur side by side: *sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam.* The translators were faced with a dilemma: they did not want to translate *hostiam* as victim, but its proximity to *sacrificium* prevented their adopting their usual course of translating it as "sacrifice". **They therefore left the whole phrase out.** (Emphasis added.)

Second Example:

The following prayer occurs in Canon IV:

123. 'Concede benignus omnibus qui ex hoc uno pane participabunt et calice, ut, in unum corpus a Sancto Spiritu congregati, in Christo hostia viva perficiantur, ad laudem gloriae tuae.'

This prayer means:

> 'Graciously grant to all who will share in this one Bread and Cup that, brought together in one body by the Holy Spirit, they may be made perfect in Christ, the living Victim, to the praise of your glory.'

ICEL translates it as follows:

> 'By your Holy Spirit, gather all who share this bread and wine into the body of Christ, a living sacrifice of praise.'

124. The word order has been seriously altered, the construction is wrong, several words and phrases have been omitted, the word *hostia* is again translated as 'sacrifice' and, to complete the act of destruction, the words 'of praise' are added to the word 'sacrifice'.

In this manner a reference to Christ, the living Victim, is destroyed and the Sacrifice of his Body and Blood is turned into a 'sacrifice of praise.' The consequence is a grave distortion of the Church's teaching.

Third Example:

125. The ICET (International Consultation on English Texts) Creed translates the phrase *consubstantialem Patri* as *of one being with the Father.* Any translation of the Nicene Creed which does not use the word 'substance' shows an heretical intent.

126. The word 'consubstantial,' meaning *of the same substance* (*homoousios* in Greek), is the only word the Arians and semi-Arians could not use without renouncing their heresy. Pope St Damasus (366-384) anathematized all who refused to use the term 'consubstantial'. The Greek term (*homoousios*) was incorporated into the Latin Creeds as is shown by the Eleventh Council of Toledo in 675 which has:

> 'We also believe him to be of one substance with the Father, and he is therefore called *Homoousios* with the Father, that is of the same substance with the Father. For the Greek word *homos* means "same" and *ousia* means substance, and together they signify having the same substance.'

127. The semi-Arians coined the word *Homoiousios* 'of like substance.' This could be interpreted in an orthodox sense, i.e. exactly alike, or in an unorthodox sense, i.e. like, but not identical. With that in mind it is instructive to peruse the explanation proffered by ICET

justifying its use of 'of one being with the Father,' as a translation of *consubstantialem Patri.*

128. ICET has:

> 'The term *homoousios* is difficult to translate, but "being" seems preferable to either "nature" or "essence" in a statement which tries to express the unity of the godhead. Many consultants agreed that "being" came nearest to the Greek philosophical term, even in its etymology. The argument of the sentence is that, because the Son is not made but begotten, he shares ***the same kind of being*** as the Father.' (Emphasis added.)

129. The first legitimate comment on the above is that *homoousios* is not difficult to translate at all. For centuries it has been and is still rendered accurately by the term 'consubstantial'.

130. Of considerably more importance, however, is the fact that the statement 'he shares the same kind of being as the Father' is a clear affirmation of semi-Arianism, the heresy which said that the Son did not have the one same substance as the Father (*homoousios*) but had the same kind of substance as the Father (*homoiousios*). It is not Catholic to say that the Son 'shares the same kind of substance (being) as the Father'.

131. With that in mind it may not come as a surprise to discover that the Preface to Eucharistic prayer IV contains a straightforward affirmation not of semi-Arianism but of Arianism. It reads:

> 'Father in heaven, it is right that we should give you thanks and glory: you ***alone*** are God, living and true.'

Michael Davies (PPNM p.621) notes that this could be a stanza from one of the hymns which Arius used to propagate his heresy.

The Latin of the Preface from which that is taken reads: *Vere dignum est tibi gratias agere, vere justum est te glorificare, Pater sancte, quia unus es Deus vivus et verus,* ... etc..

Fourth Example

132. 'For you and for all, so that sins may be forgiven' is not a translation of the Latin *pro vobis et pro multis in remissionem peccatorum.* Nor is it simply a mistranslation. It is not a translation of any kind whether 'mis...' or otherwise. It derives from elsewhere.

133. When ICEL produced *for all,* it was not reading and translating the Latin *pro multis.* It was not reading and translating anything. It was uncritically reproducing the aberrant conclusions of a Protestant by name Joachim Jeremias, occupant of the Chair of New Testament in the University of Gottingen.

134. Professor Jeremias 'discovered' that Our Lord at the Last Supper really said:

> 'This is ... my blood ... shed *for all men'.*

What is presented as proof of this is to be found on pp.34-5 of ICEL's booklet, *The Roman Canon in English Translation*, published by Geoffrey Chapman Ltd. of London, Dublin and Melbourne, copyright 1967, where we read, with my underlining, the following:

> ***Line 65: Pro multis***

'multitude' thus served also in the inclusive sense for the whole, even though the corresponding Greek and the Latin appear to have an exclusive sense, i.e. 'the many' rather than 'the all'. Cf. J.Jeremias. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (New York, 1966) pp. 179-182, 229. (My emphasis.)

135. The introductory sentence of the above, viz. Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess a word for 'all', is reproduced as it appears in ICEL's booklet. In correct English it should read: 'Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possesses a word for "all".'

136. If ICEL cannot handle English grammar what confidence can one have when they rashly launch themselves onto Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek and Latin?

137. Page 179 of *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, to which ICEL directs us, has this, viz.:

> '15. 14-24 *pollon ("many")*. While "many" in Greek (as in English) stands in opposition to "all", and therefore has the exclusive sense (*"many, but not all"*), Hebrew *rabbim* can have the inclusive sense (*"the whole, comprising many individuals"*). This inclusive use is connected with the fact that Hebrew and Aramaic **possess no word for "all".** ' (My emphasis.)

138. The relevance of all this is that with the supposed absence of a word for 'all' in Aramaic and Hebrew, our Lord, intending (according to ICEL) to say 'all' had available to him only (according to ICEL) an ambiguous word, viz. *rabbim,* which, it is said, can mean 'many' as well as 'all'.

How did ICEL know that Our Lord intended to say 'all' and not 'many', if both 'all' and 'many' are possible renderings of *rabbim*? For some nineteen centuries everybody, including St Peter's amanuensis, St Mark, was sure he wanted to say 'for many'.

139. That St Mark thought he meant 'many' is evident from his Gospel, written in Greek, a language which does not labour under the supposed ambiguity and which has, incontestably 'for many' and not 'for all'. If Mark thought he meant 'many' then so did Peter, for Mark simply reproduced Peter's doctrine. How did ICEL know he wanted to say 'all'?

140. The fact of the matter is that ICEL did not know he wanted to say 'all'. It simply relied on Professor Jeremias. Given the clear goal, evident in all the changes taken globally, all of them pointing in the same dread direction, Professor Jeremias appears to have been a fortuitous happenstance appearing on the scene just when ICEL could get some mileage out of him.

141. Well how did Professor Jeremias know that our Lord intended to say 'all'? He did not know either, he simply preferred 'all' to 'many'. Certainly 'all' slots better into the modernist conviction of universal salvation than does 'many'.

142. Did it occur either to Professor Jeremias or to ICEL that it would be at least temerarious to charge one thousand nine hundred and fifty years of serene use of 'many,' with error? Probably not, because the mark of revolutionaries in every time and in every clime is ever boldness, resolute and inflexible will and contempt for the damage wrought in pursuit of the implementation of the motivating ideology.

143. Further, they are invariably heedless of anything which may suggest, and contemptuous of anything which proves, that they are wrong, ludicrously and calamitously wrong.

In this connection there are two matters that need airing.

First Matter Needing Airing

144. The first matter needing airing concerns *rabbim,* the principal engine driving ICEL's case. According to ICEL Our Lord used *rabbim*, and, say they, he intended by its use 'all' whereas the Church for nigh on two millenia thought, whatever word he actually used, he meant 'many'. Now, ICEL, when engaged in what it presents with a straight and solemn face as *translating,* did not translate the Latin *pro multis*, but instead this word *rabbim.*

145. If ICEL did not translate the Latin, it exited from the territory governed by *Instauratio Liturgica* (Vide:No.107 b).

146. If ICEL translated the word *rabbim* it may be inquired, why did it translate the word *rabbim*? Where did it get the word from in the first place? They dragged it out of the exterior darkness, put a spotlight on it and proceeed thereafter as though Our Blessed Lord had used it at the Last Supper. *Rabbim* is a Hebrew word, whereas it is clear, and affirmed by Professor Jeremias (see his *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* p.196), that the everyday language of Our Lord was not Hebrew but Aramaic.

147. That said, it is not improbable that our Lord spoke Hebrew at the Last Supper, since Hebrew was at that time limited to only liturgical use but there is no proof whatsoever - there is not even a hint, let alone a proof - that he did, in fact, speak in Hebrew at the Last Supper. This is attested to by Professor Jeremias - ICEL's ***only*** authority - on p.198.

148. Where did ICEL go to find the Hebrew word *rabbim*? To the Bible? To some Old Testament sacramental form? To a Hebrew dictionary? If *Rabbim* is to be found in any of those places it was of no concern to ICEL. ICEL went to only one place for *rabbim.* It went to Professor Jeremias' *The Eucharistic Prayers of Jesus.*

So, in instructing us in the ways of sacramental formulae, ICEL has lumbered us with a complete irrelevancy. So far as the word itself is concerned it is no more than a guess, a stab in the dark. So far as its relevance to our subject matter is concerned, since it is not Latin, it has none. For that matter, it is not only not Latin, it is not even written down in any context to do with our subject matter. So far as our context is concerned, it exists only in the imagination of ICEL. It is utterly without a shred of what is needed to qualify for *Instauratio Liturgica* treatment.

Second Matter Needing Airing

149. If *rabbim* is the engine driving ICEL's case, the supposed absence of any word in Hebrew or in Aramaic for 'all' is the road the engine drives along. This is the second matter to be addressed.

150. Aramaic was for several centuries the language in which the business and diplomacy of the Near East (including Indo-European nations) was conducted. No language used by a people that has attained even the rudiments of a culture could fail to distinguish between 'many' and 'all'.

151. And so it is with Aramaic. It has not failed to distinguish between 'many' and 'all'. It has a word for 'many' and it has a word for 'all'. Its word for 'many' is: *saggi'an* (hard 'g'). Its word for 'all' is *kol.* There is nothing mysterious or exotic about these words. They are in the dictionary. In alphabetical order. If ICEL had moved itself it could have found them. For that matter, if ICEL had gone to a Mass celebrated by a Lebanese priest of the Maronite rite ICEL could have heard them, or heard at least the word *many.* The form recited over the wine during the celebration of Mass in the Maronite rite is, still today, recited in the original Aramaic. There it is: *saggi'an*, written in the Missal, for all to read, on the lips of the celebrant, for all to hear.

152. *Kol* ('all'), the Aramaic word ICEL assured us does not exist, is not just a dictionary

word, it can also be found in the Bible. Certain Hebrew texts in the Hebrew Bible are recognized as translations from an Aramaic original, but here and there, notably in the Book of Daniel, certain sections remain untranslated and still in the original Aramaic. 'All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing.' is one such. It is to be found in Daniel 4:32 and shows clearly how the word *kol* is used in an actual biblical phrase.

153. Had Our Lord wanted to say 'all' he could have used *kol*. Had he used *Kol,* the evangelists would not have reported his having said 'many' i.e. *saggi'an.*

154. There is a series of volumes entitled *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* published in Wiesbaden, Germany, by Otto Harrassowitz. In volume V of this series there is to be found a text entitled *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic.* This text devotes an entire section to an explanation of the ancient Aramaic word for 'all' and expatiates on its various uses to produce 'every' and 'any', 'entire' and 'whole' and identifies the several constructions where *kol* means, quite simply and unremarkably, 'all.'

155. In the common estimation of man a translation is the rendering of what is said in one language, in terms of another language, retaining always the sense. Anyone wanting a translation, according to that description, of the Canon of the Mass, need only go to a St Andrews Daily Missal of yesteryear, or a Lasance Missal or a Marian Missal or practically any missal of yore. He will discover there the sense of the original Latin, conveniently placed side by side with the Latin being translated.

156. If what is held out as a translation of the Roman Canon turns out on investigation to be, not a translation, but the substitution of another text conveying another sense, the only way of correctly distinguishing a translation from the substitution of another text conveying another sense is to refrain from calling this latter a translation and to call it by some other term which accurately identifies it.

The term 'forgery' suggests itself.

157. When what is proffered as a translation omits words, phrases, sentences and even entire paragraphs of the original and misrenders words it suffers to remain and inserts words (not too many - one or two suffice to bring about the desired change) not in the original with a clear view to altering the sense of the original sentence and to opening the original sentence to an heretical interpretation and all of this according to an easily identified sinister end, the product may not be considered a translation. Not, at least, according to right reason.

158. If what is held out as a translation results not a translation then it is an irrelevancy so far as *Instauratio Liturgica* is concerned. *Instauratio Liturgica* is fashioned to deal, only, with translations.

Not a Translation from the Original Latin

159. Concerning No.107b above, if it transpires that the work being examined is not a translation from the original Latin then the provisions of *Instauratio Liturgica* are not applicable.

Of course if the 'translation' is not a translation to begin with, the non-translation which it is, is not going to be from the original Latin anyway. The original Latin will have served simply to provide an opportunity for the attainment of whatever end the opportunist had in view.

160. That said and assuming for the nonce and for the sake of argument that we are dealing with a translation (which in reality it is not) and not a monumental deception (which in reality it is), and, further, limiting the scope of the inquiry to the sacramental formula and, indeed, limiting the inquiry to one word within the formula, viz. **the** word, viz. 'all', the word

around which this whole investigation turns, it may be seen that 'all', presented by ICEL to a world which supinely gathered it to its bosom, is not a translation of the Latin but a mistranslation of what ICEL recklessly and without warrant said Our Lord said in Hebrew, viz. *rabbim.*

161. If 'all' is not a translation of the Latin, and specifically of the Latin *multis,* it does not come within the embrace of *Instauratio Liturgica.* If it does not come within the embrace of *Instauratio Liturgica* any approval it may receive will not avail to permit it to be *understood* in terms of the original Latin, because being *understood* in terms of the original Latin is a requirement of *Instauratio Liturgica.*

162. If we do not have a translation from the original Latin, *Instauratio Liturgica* is not interested. If *Instauratio Liturgica* is not interested neither are we.

Not a Translation from the Original Latin into the Vernacular

163. If it is not a translation (No.107a) and if, whatever it is, it is not from the original Latin (No.107b), the whatever it is is not going to be into any relevant vernacular (No.107c).

164. The end product, i.e. the vernacular, has to be relevant to the sacramental material being dealt with. Otherwise ICEL could present *Mary had a little lamb; its fleece was white as snow; and everywhere that Mary went the lamb was sure to go,* which is incontestably in the vernacular, and manifestly irrelevant and require us to bow assent, as we have done to their other irrelevancy, *for all,* these past twenty eight years.

165. If the vernacular produced is not relevant to the original matter from which it is supposedly derived, *Instauratio Liturgica* will not bestir itself. But *for all* is not relevant to *pro multis* (*for many*), its supposed source. Therefore *Instauratio Liturgica* is and will remain inapplicable.

Not a Translation of Sacramental Formulae in the Original Latin

166. No. 107d above, a conclusion deriving from the construing of *Instauratio Liturgica,* requires translations of sacramental formulae, not excluding their contexts, in order that *Instauratio Liturgica* may be applied.

167. Leaving aside for the moment that the 'translation' ICEL has provided is not a translation at all, not even a mistranslation, that which it erroneously presents as a translation is not a translation of a sacramental formula in the original Latin but a translation of a guess (ICEL's guess) based on wrong information.

168. The wrong information on which their guess is based is that Hebrew and Aramaic have no word, except, in the case of Hebrew, an ambiguous one, for *all.* The guess is that our Lord said, in Hebrew, or at least intended by what he said in Hebrew, *for all.* This at the moment of institution of the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist, at the Last Supper.

169. Since ICEL's 'translation' is not a translation of a sacramental formula, in the original Latin *Instauratio Liturgica* may not be employed.

Not a Translation which Faithfully Renders the Sense of the Original Text being Translated

170. After what has been said so far it hardly seems necessary to say more. It may suffice - I hope it will - merely baldly to affirm: *The subject 'translation' does not render the sense of the original text.*

171. It is so obvious that the 'translation' does not render the sense of the original text that I may be permitted to state that any nay-sayer who thinks otherwise bears the burden of proof.

172. If the translation does not faithfully render the sense of the original text, *Instauratio Liturgica* can not be triggered into action.

173. It results that on all counts (*vide*: 107 a,b,c,d,e.) appeal to *Instauratio Liturgica* is vain. *Instauratio Liturgica* cannot turn a disaster into a *Newchurch* triumph. *Instauratio Liturgica* is a piece of law, i.e. an *ordinatio rationis,* not a magic wand. Unless one gets it right, right at the beginning, there is nothing left for it but to go back to the beginning and start again and spend the rest of one's life in penance for getting it so calamitously and **deliberately** wrong in the first place.

APPENDIX

ACTA SS. CONGREGATIONUM

SACRA CONGREGATIO PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

DECLARATIO

De sensu tribuendo adprobationi versionum formularum sacramentalium

Instauratio liturgica, iuxta Constitutionem Concilii Vaticani II effecta, mutationes quasdam induxit etiam in formulis quae ad ipsam rituum sacramentalium essentiam pertinent. Nova haec verba, sicut et cetera, ad linguas vernaculas ita vertere oportuit ut sensus originarius secundum proprium linguarum ingenium exprimeretur. Exinde ortae sunt nonnullae difficultates quae in lucem nunc prodeunt cum illae versiones a Conferentiis Episcoporum ad adprobationem Apostolicae Sedis mittuntur. Quibus in adiunctis Sacra Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei iterum admonet necesse esse ut translatio formularum essentialium in ritibus Sacramentorum fideliter reddat sensum originarium textus typici latini; illudque recolendo notum facit:

Proposita versione formulae sacramentalis in linguam vernaculam rite examinata, Sedes Apostolica cum censet sensum ab Ecclesia intentum per eam apte significari eandem adprobat et confirmat statuens pariter sensum eiusdem secundum mentem Ecclesiae per originalem textum latinum expressum intelligendum esse.

SS.mus D.nus Noster PAULUS Pp. VI in Audientia diei 25 Ianuarii 1974 E.mo Card. Praefecto impertita adprobavit.

FRANCISCUS Card. SEPER, Praefectus Impertita

L. + S.

+ Hieronymus Hamer, O.P., *a Secretis*

RES SACRAMENTI

CHAPTER III

NO RIGHT WHATSOEVER

When the consecration form said over the wine was changed from:

> 'This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the Mystery of Faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins'

to

> 'This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven'

the question was raised: Has the Church the right to change the form of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist?

It is theologically certain that Christ instituted all the sacraments of the New Law, immediately. From that however it does not necessarily follow that he determined personally all the details of the sacred ceremony, prescribing minutely every iota relating to the matter and form to be used.

Immediate institution by Christ allows that he could merely have determined what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites without further elaborating what he wanted done. It transpires however that for two sacraments, namely, Baptism and Eucharist he did determine minutely (*in specie*) the matter and form. He left nothing for the Church to do except follow his instructions.

For the remaining five he was content to determine them in only a general way (*in genere*), that is to say, that there should be an external ceremony by which certain identified special graces were to be conferred. Further determination of these five sacraments was left to the Apostles or to the Church. They were given the power to determine whatever he had left undetermined.

To the question therefore whether the Church has the right to change the form of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist, the distinction between sacraments which have been instituted *in genere* and sacraments which have been instituted *in specie*, suggests already the reply. The Church has no right to change the form of Holy Eucharist. Diverse authorities are in agreement with that suggested conclusion as the following examples show.

Pope St Pius X in the letter, *Ex quo, nono* (Dec.26,1910), wrote:

> 'It is well known that to the Church there belongs **no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments.**'

He could say 'It is well known' because it is uninterrupted teaching down through the centuries that the Church has no right to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments.

Pope Innocent III (1198 - 1216) identifies in the narrative (i.e. the Eucharistic narrative) three elements not commemorated by the Evangelists, namely, 'with his eyes lifted up to heaven,' and 'and eternal testament' and 'the mystery of faith'. Of these elements he states that they are derived from Christ and the Apostles, and then inquires rhetorically:

'for who would be so presumptuous and daring as to insert these things out of his own devotion?'

He continues:

'In truth the Apostles received the form of the words from Christ himself, and the Church received it from the Apostles themselves.'[24]

In the letter, *Super quibusdam* (Sept.29, 1351), Pope Clement VI taught:

'The Roman Pontiff regarding the administration of the sacraments of the Church, can tolerate and even permit different rites of the Church of Christ ... **always without violating those things which pertain to the integrity and necessary parts of the Sacraments.**'

The Council of Trent, Session XXI, Chap.2, professes:

'It (the Council) declares furthermore that this power has always been in the Church, that in the administration of the sacraments, **without violating their substance,** she may determine or change whatever she may judge to be more expedient for the benefit of those who receive them or for the veneration of the sacraments, according to the variety of circumstances, times and places.'

Leo XIII (1878-1903), in his Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, avers:

'**The Church is forbidden to change, or even touch, the matter or form of any Sacrament.** She may indeed change or abolish or introduce something in the non-essential rites or "ceremonial" parts to be used in the administration of the Sacraments, such as the processions, prayers or hymns before or after the actual words of the form are recited ...'

The mind of the Church in this matter is clearly manifested in the *Missale Romanum* of Pope St Pius V in Chapter V of the document entitled, *De Defectibus* to be found amongst the various instructions at the beginning of the Roman Missal. There may be read:

'If anyone removes or changes anything in the Form of the Consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words, does not signify the same thing as these words do, **he does not confect the Sacrament.**'

On November 30, 1947, Pope Pius XII issued the Apostolic Constitution, *Sacramentum Ordinis* in which again it is asserted that the Church may not interfere with the substance of the sacraments. He writes:

'As the Council of Trent teaches, the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and **the Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments**, that is over those things which, with the sources of divine revelation as witnesses, Christ the Lord himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign.'

In this extract from the Apostolic Constitution of Pope Pius XII we are instructed as to the sense of the term 'substance' in the phrase 'substance of the sacraments.'

---

[24] *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, quoted by Maurice de la Taile in his 'The Mystery of the Faith', Theses XXIV and XXV, p.454.

Substance, as in 'substance of the sacraments,' in that Apostolic Constitution, is that

a) to which divine revelation witnesses and

b) which our Lord himself decrees to be preserved in a sacramental sign.

Over this 'substance of the sacraments', it is stated: 'the Church has no power.'

That stated, it is alarming to note that the parts changed, namely 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins' are witnessed to by divine revelation. Divine revelation is to be found in the Bible and in Tradition. 'For many' is witnessed to by Matthew and by Mark and 'unto the remission of sins' is witnessed to by Matthew.

So far as our Lord's decreeing that which is to be preserved in a sacramental sign we have our Lord's words: 'Do this in my commemoration.' (Luke 22:19). The 'this' which we are to do in his commemoration is, *inter alia*, to pronounce the words 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins,' when reciting the sacramental form over the chalice.

It must be concluded therefore that 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins' pertain to the substance of the sacrament since they are both, a) witnessed to by Holy Writ, which is part of divine revelation, and, b) required by our Lord to be preserved in the sacramental sign.

It follows that the excision of 'for many' and 'unto the remission of sins' is an attentat on the substance of the sacrament. Since the Church has no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching the substance of the sacraments, there is clearly some skullduggery afoot.

It is further to be noted that the parts which have been inserted in place of the excised parts are **not** witnessed to by divine revelation, for they are to be found neither in Holy Writ nor in tradition and have **not** been decreed by our Lord as requiring to be preserved in the sacramental sign. From this it may be concluded that the insertions are alien to the substance of the sacrament. From this it may, in turn, be concluded that there has been further skullduggery. Chapter IV will explore how it was done and will identify the devastator responsible.

In the sacrament of Holy Eucharist, that part of the form which concerns the consecration of the wine, sounds:

> 'For this is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament: the Mystery of Faith: which shall be shed for you and for many, unto the remission of sins.'

Concerning this form, the Catechism of the Council of Trent states that we are firmly to believe that it consists in the above quoted words and adds that 'of this form no one can doubt.'

Virtually all theologians hold that all those quoted words belong to the substance of the form. Not all, however, hold that all those words, though appertaining to the substance, are necessary for validity of the sacrament. Some opine that the first few words: 'This is the chalice of my blood,' would suffice for validity. The remaining words, they say, are necessary, not for validity but for the integrity or completeness of the form.

Be all that as it may, both the short-formers and the long-formers, are agreed that all the words of the form as presented above are of the substance of the sacrament, though both the one and the other understand the term 'substance' according to their own lights.

Both the one and the other, therefore, may not themselves accept, or give comfort to those who accept, the mutilation: *for all, so that sins may be forgiven*, because this is an innovation touching the substance of the sacrament. Since no one on earth has power over

the substance of the sacraments, *for all, so that sins may be forgiven* is nothing other than a violation of the substance of the sacrament.

The mind of the Church, expressed by Pope St Pius X, Pope Innocent III, Pope Clement VI, the Council of Trent, Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XII quoted above, reveals itself in Chapter V of *De Defectibus*, also quoted above, as follows:

> 'If anyone omits or changes anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in this change of words the words do not mean the same thing, then he does not confect the Sacrament.' (*De Defectibus, V*)

As it happens, ICEL opines that *for all* and *for many* do mean the same thing. For those - they must surely be few, if any - who opine similarly I have demonstrated, in a work of heroic supererogation, to be found in Nos. 72 to 89, of Chapter 1 of this work, where I adduce three authorities in support, that the Church is not of the same opinion. But, further, for those who, nevertheless, remain of the opinion that *for all* and *for many* do mean the same thing, the very next sentence drawn from *De Defectibus V* may suffice to render any such thought irrelevant.

The very next sentence reads:

> 'If words are added which do not alter the meaning, then the Sacrament is valid, but the celebrant commits a mortal sin in making such an addition.' (*De Defectibus V*)

Now if it transpires, despite my conviction to the contrary, that *for many* and *for all*, do mean the same thing, then the words *for all* do not alter the meaning, but since they were not there before, but are there now (i.e. in the form over the wine) they have been added. In that case then the above last quoted sentence of *De Defectibus* indicates that we are dealing with grave matter, the first requirement, amongst three, of mortal sin, which with regard to the use of *for all* is certainly a discouraging factor.

It is a matter of fact that the words of the form over the wine have been changed. They have been changed from: *for you and for many* to *for you and for all*, and from: *unto the remission of sins* to *so that sins may be forgiven.*

It is matter for wonder that the short-formers, by affirming that the words 'This is the cup of my blood,' suffice for transubstantiation and therefore for validity, all the while affirming that the long form appertains to the substance of the sacrament, find themselves enmeshed in a contradiction. That they are in this embarrassing situation is supported by the following argumentation.

The Church has no power over the substance of any of the sacraments. If it has no power over the substance of any of the sacraments it is starkly obvious that it has no power over the sacrament of Holy Eucharist which, as is universally admitted, was instituted *in specie*. The fact that that sacrament was instituted *in specie* leaves to the Church nothing to do except what it has been told to do.

We learn from Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary that:

> 'The Council of Trent defines that though the Church may change rites and ceremonies, it cannot alter the "substance" of the sacraments. This follows from the very nature of a sacrament. The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. This power depends solely on the will of God, who has made the grace promised depend on the use of certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence the sacrament is altogether absent.'

Now if *for all* and *for many* mean the same thing, as ICEL equivalently affirms when it

avers that *for all* and *for many* correctly translate *pro multis*, then the introduction of *for all* in place of *for many* will not cause the words of the form to be 'altered in their essence.'

On the other hand if *for all* and *for many* do not mean the same thing (which is a proposition likely to meet with the approval and assent of not a few people) then we are met with a change in the substance of the sacrament. That is so since these two phrases, expressing different significations, are universally acknowledged to be part of the substance. The substituting of one phrase for the other is to cause the words of the form to be 'altered in their essence'. He who alters the form in its essence does not confect the sacrament.

The contradiction resides in this that the 'short formers' hold that the words 'this is my blood' suffice for validity so that so far as validity is concerned it matters not at all whether the words *for many* or the words *for all* follow the core words 'this is my blood.' In either case transubstantiation, they say, is effected. But the 'short formers' like 'long formers,' admit that the words *for many*, or the words *for all*, as the case may be - you can take your pick - belong to the substance of the sacrament.

If the words *for many* are allowed to remain, nothing untoward occurs. Other things being equal the sacrament proceeds. But if the words *for all* are employed, then, on the premise that *for many* and *for all* do not mean the same thing we are confronted with an assault on the substance of the sacrament.

The change has produced words which do not mean the same thing as is meant by the words changed. The result of that is, according to the mind of the Church, expressed in *De Defectibus*, that the celebrant does not confect the sacrament.

> 'If anyone omits or changes anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in this change of words the words do not mean the same thing, then he does not confect the Sacrament.'

The criterion is whether the words resulting from the change mean or do not mean the same thing. If they do not mean the same thing, as we are presently supposing, the sacrament is not confected, yet according to the 'short formers' the sacrament has already been confected before the celebrant gets to the offending words. The celebrant then goes on to pronounce the offending words, which results in the sacrament not being confected. The only route out of the dilemma is to admit that the words 'this is my blood' alone do not suffice to effect transubstantiation.

In any consideration of this matter of whether the Church has the right to alter the sacramental form, eventually one's gaze lifts to the Supreme Pontiff, who, it is commonly believed, has changed the words of the form from *for many* to *for all.*

An investigation into precisely that matter reveals that the Supreme Pontiff did not change the words *for many.* He retained them. Proof of that is to be found in the originating legislation, underpinning the *Novus Ordo Missae*, the Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum,* paragraph six where one may read that the words to be pronounced over the wine are: *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei ... qui pro vobis et* ***pro multis*** *effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.*

Prior to Pope Paul's Missale Romanum of 3rd April 1969, *Notitiae*, 1968, presented a decree and four Eucharistic Prayers of which numbers II, III and IV, prepared by *Consilium* at the command of the Supreme Pontiff, were new. As to the new Eucharistic Prayers II,III, and IV the words to be pronounced over the wine are, as one would expect: *pro multis.*

As to Eucharistic Prayer I, i.e. the Roman Canon, *Notitiae*, instead of reproducing the text, which was available then everywhere, has, under the heading *Prex Eucharistica I, seu Canon Romanus*, the simple legend: *Ut in Missali Romano*, that is, 'As in the Roman

Missal.'

It results therefore that, *de jure*, no change has taken place in the Latin of the immemoria Mass. *De facto* the ICEL vandals have laid waste the entire territory.

'But,' it may be objected, 'does not the Pope himself use the vernacular mutilation *for all* instead of the correct words *for many*?' He does, alas! But, so what? He is not in his infallible mode when he is saying Mass. When he is saying Mass, he is no more than any priest, who may be concelebrating with him. The priest concelebrating with the Pope, and using *for all* is celebrating invalidly, as is also the Pope.

In the matter of concelebration, it is interesting to note that if they were concelebrating before the promulgation of the 1983 Code of Canon law, they were also concelebrating contrary to the provision of Canon 803 of the 1917 Code. There may be some legislation somewhere, I know not where, amending the 1917 Code in this matter.

In that connection, mention is made of concelebration in Pope Paul's *Missale Romanum*. In paragraph six may be read: 'However, for pastoral reasons, and in order to facilitate concelebration, we have ordered ... etc.'

That 'facilitation' may be, though it seems unlikely, given the incidence of concelebration around the world, merely to aid the concelebration of which Canon 803 of the 1917 Code speaks, namely, concelebration of Masses of ordination and Masses of consecration of Bishops.

The fact that the Holy Father uses the vernacular, in whatever country he may find himself in, does not lend validity to an invalid form. Further, even if the Holy Father were to advert to the problems and were to move to resolve the problems by a papal ukase or papal *fiat*, the problems would not go away, since, in the words of Pope St Pius X quoted above: 'it is well known that to the Church there belongs **no right whatsoever** to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments.'

Further, even were there such a right, the basic necessity would always remain that the changed form would have to be a valid form. *For all* is not a valid form. The changed form would have to signify the *res sacramenti* of that sacrament. If it does not do that there will be no *res sacramenti*. No *res sacramenti*, no sacrament; no sacrament, no Mass.

The question asked and responded to so far is: Has the Church the right to change the form of the sacrament of Holy Eucharist? The answer is manifestly in the negative. Monsignor Klaus Gamber, in his *Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, devotes a chapter to another but allied question: Has the Pope the authority to change the rite?

The following argumentation concludes to there being no authority vested in the Pope to change, still less to abolish, any rite. From that it would seem that anyone celebrating the New Order of Mass, should cease so doing forthwith, on the grounds that, quite apart from its doubtful validity, the New Order of Mass is devoid of liceity. It has emerged from a putative legislative source acting *ultra vires*.

Monsignor Gamber explains that a *Rite* may be defined as the mandatory forms of the liturgical cult that, in the final analysis, originated with Christ, and then, based on shared traditions, developed independently and were later officially sanctioned by the Church hierarchy.

He draws certain conclusions from that definition. He concludes first that since the liturgical rite evolved on the basis of shared tradition, it cannot consequently be developed anew in its entirety.

Secondly, he reasons that since the liturgical rite has developed over time, further development continues to be possible. But such continuing development has to respect the timeless character of all rites; and its development has to be organic in nature.

Thirdly, he states that there are different, independent liturgical rites in the universal Church. In the Western Church, in addition to the Roman rite, there are the Gallican rite (now defunct), the Ambrosian rite, and the Mozarabic rite. In the East, among others, the Byzantine rite, the Armenian rite, the Syriac rite and the Coptic rite.

Every one of these rites has gone through a process of independent growth and developed its very own characteristics. Thus, Monsignor Gamber states that it is not appropriate simply to exchange or substitute individual liturgical elements between different rites, to make use, for example, of a Eucharistic prayer or Canon of the Eastern Church and incorporate it into the Roman rite as has been done in the New Order of the Mass, nor is it appropriate to do the opposite, that is, to make the Roman Canon of the Mass part of Eastern liturgies.

Fourthly, every liturgical rite constitutes an organically developed, homogeneous unit. To change any of its essential elements is to destroy the rite in its entirety.

With these principles in mind one is constrained to conclude that the publication of the *Novus Ordo Missae* of 1969 created a new liturgical rite. That is to say that while the Council intended a revision of the traditional liturgical rite, what took place was not a revision of the traditional rite but its complete abolition - a couple of years later it was forbidden. The revisers did not want merely revision, they wanted extirpation.

So radical a reform as that does not follow the tradition of the Church, neither does it stem from the Council, it is not an organic growth of what obtained before, it is instead altogether novel, it is an innovation quite without precedent in all the Church's history, and for that reason alone is to be looked at askance.

It might be thought that there is place here for appeal to the Pope's full and supreme power, i.e., his *plena et suprema potestas*, as per the First Vatican Council, but that power is power over matters that pertain to the discipline and rule of the Church spread out over all the world (Denziger, 1831). But the term 'discipline' (*disciplina*) does not apply to the liturgical rite of the Mass. That should be obvious enough in the light of the fact that the popes have repeatedly observed that the rite is founded on apostolic tradition.

The Pope has to follow the tradition of the universal Church. That is why he is Pope in the first place. He has to follow tradition and see to it that everyone else follows it too. The tradition of the universal Church is, as Vincent of Lerins says, what has always been believed, everywhere and by all, i.e. *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*

In this connection there are authors who state quite explicitly that it is clearly outside the Pope's authority to abolish the traditional rite. Francisco Suarez, *Doctor Eximius*, (1548-1617), eminent theologian, member of the Society of Jesus, citing earlier authors such as Tommaso Cardinal Cajetan O.P., (1469-1534), took the position that the Pope would be schismatic 'if he were to change all the liturgical rites of the Church that have been upheld by Apostolic tradition.'

Since there is no document that specifically assigns to the Apostolic See the authority to change, let alone to abolish the traditional liturgical rite and since, furthermore, it can be shown that not a single predecessor of Pope Paul VI has ever introduced major changes to the Roman liturgy, the assertion that the Holy See has the authority to change the liturgical rite emerges as without support and gratuitously affirmed.

RES SACRAMENTI

CHAPTER IV

HOW IT HAPPENED

'I suspect you will find Fred McManus at the centre of the web.' Thus L. Brent Bozell, early in 1968, addressing Gary Potter, founding member of *Triumph* magazine, and suggesting he write 'an article on how the Mass gets changed.'

It was brief guidance, but sufficient. The result was published in May, 1968 and is very nearly my only source for what follows. It had been debated what to call the article. Finally, mindful of the dictionary definition of a club - 'A select number of persons in the habit of meeting for the promotion of some common object,' according to *The New Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language* - it was decided to entitle it 'The Liturgy Club.' A photo of Father McManus was put on the cover of the magazine. The caption read, 'The President of the Liturgy Club.'

The 'Liturgy Club' is not to be thought of as an official organization, such as a society, incorporated or not as the case may be, with, say, dues-paying members and other identifying notes of societies generally. It would not have a letter head. It would not have, say, a president, a secretary, treasurer and the like, though functions of that kind could be performed by individuals invited *ad hoc* to do so, should it be thought convenient. It is instead, quite simply, 'a select number of persons in the habit of meeting for the promotion of some common object.' Which object, efficiently and ruthlessly pursued and achieved, has wrecked the Western Church.

The term 'Liturgy Club' is then a term of convenience to describe a reality which could be likened to a corporate *eminence grise*. You don't see much of it, you are not sure quite what it is or where it is, but its influence permeates everything.

The most prominent expression of the United States liturgical scene since 1940 is something called, simply, the Liturgical Conference. Power in this organization resides in its board of directors. The membership of the board is pretty much co-terminous with the 'Liturgy Club'. The chairman of the board is always the president of the Conference.

From early days, even way back in the forties and fifties and before, members of the board, notably Father Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B., urged that the Conference actively sponsor vernacularization. Father Diekmann became editor-in-chief of *Worship*, the more-or-less official publication, indeed bulletin, of the 'Liturgy Club'. The masthead of *Worship* listed Fr. McManus as an associate editor.

In 1959 Fr McManus became the Conference president. Massive reorganization took place. The Liturgical Conference began to *move*.

The board created a permanent staff to administer the increasing work load. A direct link was established with the American hierarchy. The Conference was now to have an official episcopal adviser. It was established by statute that the episcopal adviser would be the chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, the BCL.

The Conference began to exercise far reaching influence in the years 1961-62 when various bishops appealed to it to help collect material and prepare proposals for the approaching Vatican Council.

Father McManus spent the years 1962-64 in Rome as a Council *Peritus*. Another associate editor of *Worship*, Father Gerard S. Sloyan, kept the Conference President's chair warm for

him until he returned for a final year (1964-65). It was during this term that Father McManus became, on January 1, 1965, the Director of the Secretariat of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, that is, the BCL.

This Secretariat is described in the *Catholic Almanac* as the continuing working body of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy and served as a channel for the communication of official documents among the bishops, as an information office for the bishops and diocesan liturgical commissions, and as a liaison agent between various organizations concerned with liturgical renewal.

The episcopal adviser to the Liturgical conference, being as he was, the chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, would have asked the Liturgical Conference board to recommend someone to assume the position of director. This individual would run the BCL Secretariat and implement the hierarchy's official renewal programme.

As chairman of the Conference board Father McManus would have received the request from the BCL chairman. He would then have courteously communicated the board's choice, which, by the nature of these things, would naturally turn out to be, ah, Father Fred McManus.

The United States hierarchy was re-organized after Vatican II into the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB). Of course the NCCB has its own secretariat, a formidable bureaucracy known as the United States Catholic Conference (USCC). The BCL is both a department of the NCCB and a department, one of many, of the USCC.

One of the consequences of this complex arrangement is that Father McManus, as executive officer of the BCL, not only has the duty of guiding the corporate body of bishops in liturgical affairs, he also has at his disposal the well-oiled and well-heeled machinery of the USCC to publicize and implement the decisions he helps the bishops to make. The task of making so extensive an organization as that, function, requires a man of considerable talent. Father McManus was such a man.

The very complexity of such an arrangement, calls into play the First Law of bureaucracy: If you turn your business over to one only individual, the bureaucrat you put in charge will tend to take over the business itself. He has to take over everything because only he knows how to work the machinery. Power was increasing in Father McManus' hands in large increments at a time but so far the increments I have indicated, were contained in the United States scene.

While all this was going on in the United States another bureaucracy, this time an international one, began to be in the ascendant. Its name: The International Committee for English in the Liturgy (ICEL). ICEL had its own intricate chain of command and accompanying procedures.

All the various English-speaking Episcopal Conferences around the world formed the head of this body, which resulted in another very complex arrangement. To make such a top heavy body function, there was formed what is known as the International Episcopal Committee. This episcopal committee was made up of selected bishops from the different episcopal conferences. I recall that Bishop Snedden, gone to his reward this many a year, was New Zealand's representative. There may have been others from this country, but I do not know.

The International Episcopal Committee made yearly reports. Listed in the report for 1966, as secretary-treasurer, was Father McManus. The following year the report for 1967 shows Fr McManus as treasurer and Father Gerard Sigler as Executive Secretary. These reports, of course, issue from the secretariat of the International Episcopal Committee, which in turn is ICEL reduced to manageable proportions.

It is interesting to learn that this secretariat is located in the Washington offices of the Liturgical Conference and to recall that both Fr. McManus and Fr Sigler, the two people who make ICEL work, are, with a few others, components of the 'Liturgy Club' whose stamping ground is the Liturgical Conference.

It would have made sense for the ICEL secretariat to have been accommodated in the USCC building, but that option was not taken because, as Mr Manion, who was the Liturgical Conference's executive director at the time this matter was being arranged explained: 'They didn't want it to look like the ICEL was completely dominated by Americans. That's why they didn't want to put ... (Father Sigler) ... in the ... (USCC) Building... so he wouldn't be there right under Father McManus.'

Why did they bother? It was already becoming clear that ICEL, far from being an international organization of autonomous prelates, was developing into a cosy little home body, but with far flung minions around the world, doing the bidding of one man.

Beneath the International Episcopal Committee is to be found ICEL's real working body - the all-important Advisory Committee. This is where the Canon of the Mass was subjected to something mendaciously bruited abroad as a translation. This is where new canons and other parts of the Mass undergo the same treatment. The members of the Advisory Committee for the United states were: Professor George Harrison, Professor Emeritus, University of Michigan, Father Godfrey Diekmann of *Worship* and Father Frederick McManus.

It is very instructive to see how things in this area of our interest happen. The decision is made to 'translate' the fifteen-century-plus old Roman Canon into English. The decision was made by the members of the Club.

That means that the decision was made by the Liturgical Conference Board, the BCL, *Worship*, Father McManus, Father Diekmann, Father Sigler *et al.*, all Club members. The decision was made without any instructions from the hierarchy. No poll of the faithful was taken. No steps at all were ever taken to determine whether anyone outside the Club wanted a vernacular Canon or, for that matter, a vernacular Mass. The Club simply decided.

Under the supervision of the Advisory Committee, the translators, who can be simply the members themselves of the Advisory Committee, got down to work. They 'translated.'

The translation was then approved by the ICEL Advisory Committee. There was one only dissenting vote - that of Professor H.P.R.Finberg of England. The translation was passed to the English speaking Episcopal Conferences. This means that Father McManus sent the translation, which he had already approved as member of the Advisory Committee, to himself as Director of the BCL Secretariat for transmission to the BCL itself.

The BCL, that is to say, Father McManus, passed the translation to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the NCCB. The United States Bishops, in the corporate personality of the NCCB, voted their 'approbation.' The voted their 'approbation' without however actually seeing the translation. Said one Archbishop who was afterwards interviewed: 'They did not distribute the text so that we could review it.' The interviewer inquired: 'Did you vote, then, simply on the recommendation of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy?' The Archbishop replied: 'Yes.'

In some measure present to all this toing and froing was Rome, represented by the 'Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,' known most commonly as the 'Consilium,' though often and characteristically called the 'Postconciliar Liturgical Commission' in the *Newsletter* of the BCL. The *Newsletter* of the BCL is edited by Father McManus.

The Consilium is a new creation emerging from Vatican II. The Consilium is supposed to share responsibility in many cases with the Sacred Congregation of Rites. In practice, it exercises its own competence.

After a liturgical change receives the 'approbation' of the NCCB (all the moving and shaking at this moment is taking place in the United states) the change is supposed to receive the 'confirmation' of the Holy See, i.e. of the Consilium, before it actually goes into practice. The Consilium would route anything sent it and needing confirmation to its appropriate consultants.

Sometime prior to any concrete activity of that kind in this area, Father McManus became a consultant to the Consilium. At this stage Father McManus may fairly be described as ubiquitous. Wherever there is a 'where' to be, he is there and he is not standing around looking decorative, he is at work.

So, the translation which the United States hierarchy, i.e. our candid Archbishop, together with his confreres, approved, without seeing, approved simply on the say-so of Father McManus, was posted off by Father McManus to the Consilium, where the same Father McManus, originator, with others in the 'Club,' and chief helmsman of the whole initiative, was, as consultant, awaiting its arrival.

At this point something approximating a set back occurred. Consilium did not 'confirm.' The set back may be described as 'approximate' because Consilium returned the English Canon to the International Episcopal Committee not with an *anathema* which it fully deserved but with the instruction that its use be regarded as 'temporary.'

This minor hiccup in the smooth progress of the destruction of the Church was not given any publicity. Only the inner circle knew of it. Father McManus, of course, knew of it. He had to remove his hat as consultant to Consilium and, as executive officer of the International Episcopal Committee, had to convey the decision not to 'confirm,' to the English speaking Episcopal Conferences. Australia and Ireland decided not to proceed with the thing for the time being.

Meanwhile, Father McManus as director of the BCL is receiving the adverse decision, which, as handler of the International Episcopal Conference, he had posted to himself, and is proceeding to pass it on to the BCL Committee members.

What to do? What does the BCL do? It passes, now for the second time, the same unconfirmed and **still unrevealed** text to the NCCB, who vote, for the second time, their 'approbation.'

October 22, 1967 the new 'Canon' emerges from its wraps, into the light of day. Whereupon the Liturgical Conference issued a statement proclaiming that the Canon would 'develop a new understanding of our Mass.'

From then on it has been all downhill. One disobedience after another, with Rome subsequently traipsing along behind, giving authorization to successive disobediences, after some convulsive token protests.

Carefully undisclosed, even to the general membership of the ICEL Advisory Committee, was the fact that an official letter from the Consilium, dated Novermber 29, 1967, explicitly demanded the revision of the current English Canon. Similarly, carefully undisclosed was the fact that two subsequent letters, asking when a 'definitive' text would be ready, were sent by Consilium and ignored by the addressee. Such correspondence is, as a matter of course, routed through the ICEL secretariat, where it is dealt with, or, not dealt with, if expedience

It has become as Father McManus predicted, to the speechless disbelief of Gary Potter interviewing him:

'Ultimately the approval of the Holy See will probably be dispensed with, since it does not figure in the Constitution on the Liturgy.'

As late as 1965 *Consilium* was protesting that permission would never be given for a vernacular Canon. In 1967, May the 4th. *Tres Abhinc Annos*, otherwise known as the *Instructio Altera*, i.e. the 'Second Instruction on the Proper Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,' was promulgated. It granted permission for the whole Mass, including the canon, to be said aloud and in the vernacular.

Father Coughlin reveals[1] that: 'The immediate cause of this was the American's hierarchy's request that the Canon of the Mass be allowed to be said out loud and in the vernacular.'

Father Coughlin adds: 'Other hierarchies were not slow to follow their lead.'

Rome wanted a single translation for each linguistic group. Michael Davies[2] states that for English speaking countries. this meant, in practice, that other hierarchies had to go along with whatever the American bishops approved. It soon became clear that the American hierarchy was prepared to approve whatever the ICEL bureaucracy told it to approve, read or not read, as the scandalous example given above proves beyond cavil of doubt.

In practice, the final arbiter of what ICEL would advance for approval was determined by Father Frederick R. McManus, who, for practical purposes, had become the Liturgical Puppet Master for the entire English-speaking world.

The puppets loved him. Two of them, Cardinal Gray for Scotland and Archbishop G. P. Dwyer for England and Wales. did not simply defend his indefensible travesty of the Roman Canon but waxed lyrical in its praise. They reported its considerable measure of success, even asserting that, as a translation, it accurately conveyed the sense of the original. This, surely, is proof that they, like their American colleagues, simply did not read it, or if they did read it, then they did so without engaging the intellect. Further, they would have it that it combined dignity with simplicity of language and possessed a rhythm suitable for public recitation.

It is not to be thought that only English speakers were intent, mindlessly or otherwise, on destroying the Mass. The rest of the world was at it too. But the point of focus of this writing is the new Mass as mediated to us in English and the purpose of this chapter is to show only that whatever may be thought of the Pauline Mass, whether one embraces it or not, in fact, nobody in the English-speaking world is actually saying it. What is being said is not Paul's Mass but Fred's Mass, as may be verified by anybody with the hardiness to compare, beginning with the words of consecration and expanding from there backwards and forwards to the extremities, the mass rite of Paul VI with the mass rite, darling of the Liturgy 'Club', rammed through the steps of a contrived procedure, by the vigour, tenacity and all round exceptional competence of Frederick R. McManus.

[1] *The New Mass: A Pastoral Guide* (London, 1969).

[2] *Pope Paul's New Mass.* (Angelus Press, 1980), p.45.